



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



BS
710
E96

THE EXPOSITOR
VOL. V.

List of Contributors to Volume IV.

- VERY REV. J. H. BERNARD, D.D., D.C.L.
REV. PROFESSOR T. K. CHEYNE, D.D., LITT.D.
STANLEY A. COOK, M.A.
REV. CANON G. A. COOKE, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR ADOLF DEISSMANN, D.D., D.THEOL.
REV. PROFESSOR JAMES DENNEY, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR S. R. DRIVER, D.D., LITT.D.
REV. ALEX. R. EAGAR, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR G. G. FINDLAY, D.D.
REV. PRINCIPAL A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., LITT.D.
PROFESSOR J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., LITT.D.
J. H. A. HART, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR W. F. LOFTHOUSE, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, M.A., LITT.D.
REV. GEORGE MILLIGAN, D.D.
REV. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR J. H. MOULTON, M.A., LITT.D.
REV. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR JAMES ORR, D.D.
PROFESSOR SIR W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D., D.D.
REV. PROFESSOR J. H. ROPES, D.D.
REV. G. A. JOHNSTON ROSS, M.A.
REV. J. G. SIMPSON, M.A.
REV. R. H. STRACHAN, M.A.
REV. J. DE ZWAAN, D.D.

THE EXPOSITOR

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

SEVENTH SERIES

Volume V

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C

MCMVIII 1908

**BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.**

THE MORNING STAR AND THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE LIFE OF CHRIST.

THE connexion between the two parts of the above title is not obvious at first sight. It is the merit of Colonel Mackinlay, in the book which we propose to review, on *The Magi : How they Recognized Christ's Star*,¹ to have shown that there is a very real connexion. His title is, perhaps, not very well chosen, for it does not allude to any of the parts and topics which seem to me to be the most important and interesting in his work, while it emphasizes what is most speculative and least convincing. Although the present writer has written a brief preface to the book, it seems not out of place for him to review ; indeed it appears justifiable, and almost obligatory, to state more fully than was possible in the few paragraphs of his preface the reasons which make him consider that the book deserves careful reading.

That men, when conversing familiarly with one another, and speaking naturally and easily, usually draw any figures of speech and symbolism which they may chance to employ from the range of their own interests and knowledge is a principle that cannot be denied and will be freely admitted by every one. The lawyer uses legal metaphors, the stock-broker the slang of the exchange, in explaining his meaning. The contrast in this respect between St. Paul's language and that of most of the writers in the Bible is well known, and has often been pointed out, as, e.g., in the EXPOSITOR, September, 1906, p. 282 ff. He uses the language of city

¹ Hodder & Stoughton, 1907.

life and of education, and, to some extent, of business and trade. The Bible generally contains a far larger proportion of metaphors and imagery drawn from the phenomena of nature, the wind, the rain, the storm, the heavens, sun and stars, the growing and dying or harvested vegetation of the earth, etc.

In regard to the imagery of this latter class a second principle may be observed. Those who live and talk in the open air tend to draw their illustrations from what is present and visible to, or in the mind of, their hearers and themselves at the time. Probably every expositor and preacher has occasionally drawn his inspiration more or less unconsciously from this principle, and every careful reader has sometimes been impressed with particular instances of it. But the formal commentators do not make sufficient use of it. It is not obvious to the secluded scholar in his study amid the atmosphere of books. You feel it most strongly in the world of life. Sir Isaac Newton, however, though he was (so far as I know) unused to life in the open air as well as unfamiliar with the Mediterranean lands, perceived this principle, and stated it in a very interesting passage which is quoted by Colonel Mackinlay. It is not one of the least of the merits of his book that it gives prominence to this excellent observation of a great man ; if I may suppose that the passage is as unfamiliar to the world of scholars as it was to me. "I observe that Christ and His forerunner John in their parabolic discourses were wont to allude to things present. The old prophets, when they would describe things emphatically, did not only draw parables from things which offered themselves, as from the rent of a garment (1 Sam. xv. 27, 28) . . . from the vessels of a potter (Jer. xviii. 3-6) . . . but also, when such fit objects were wanting, they supplied them by their own actions, as by rending a garment (1 Kings xi. 30, 31) ; by shooting (2 Kings

xiii. 17-19), etc. By such types the prophets loved to speak. And Christ, being endued with a nobler prophet spirit than the rest, excelled also in this kind of speaking, yet so as not to speak by His own actions—that were less grave and decent—but to turn into parables such things as offered themselves. On occasion of the harvest approaching He admonishes His disciples once and again of the spiritual harvest (John iv. 35 ; Matt. ix. 37). Seeing the lilies of the field, He admonishes His disciples about gay clothing (Matt. vi. 28). In allusion to the present season of fruits, He admonishes His disciples about knowing men by their fruits. In the time of the Passover, when trees put forth their leaves, He bids His disciples ‘learn a parable from the fig tree ; when his branch is yet tender and putteth forth leaves, ye know that the summer is nigh.’ ” This admirable passage is quoted from Newton’s *Commentary on Daniel*, a work which is proverbial in modern times for fanciful and strained interpretations, and which I confess that I have never even seen ; but if there is much more in it like this paragraph, it must be better worth reading than some modern commentaries, for this is original and true.

The Author mentions several other examples in corroboration of Newton’s principle. One pair of examples is peculiarly interesting. In Matthew xx. 1-16 occurs the parable of the householder, who went out early in the morning to hire labourers into his vineyard. Every one who studies ancient literature or life knows the strong prejudice that was entertained against hired labourers alike in Palestine and in Italy in ancient times. The “hireling” was despised as untrustworthy and idle, an unwilling labourer who worked for money and not for interest in or love of the work. He was always looking for the reward and the pay for his labour, not aiming at doing it well for its own sake (Job vii. 2). John x. 12 f. contrasts

the cowardly hireling with the true shepherd ; the former neglects the sheep, and flees when the wolf approaches, but the true shepherd defends them to the death. So in Italy *mercennarii* or hired labourers were always disliked, and contempt is often expressed for them. A man who wanted important or delicate work well done employed the members of his own family, especially his household slaves.¹ Every person who attempts to explain to a class the spirit of ancient Roman life has constant occasion to insist on this ; and it applies also to Greek life, though it is not there so strongly forced on one's attention.

Why is it that the kingdom of heaven, the prophets and the servants of God, are compared by Matthew in this passage to hirelings, who all receive the same pay at the end of the day, whether they have worked in the vineyard one hour or a whole day ? In Matthew xxi. 28 it is the owner's son who works in the vineyard ; in John xv. 2 the owner himself is the workman. What is the reason for this difference ? In the first passage there is no stress laid on the trustworthiness or untrustworthiness of the hired labourers, the only point of comparison lies in the reward that is given to all alike : so much is true, but this does not quite satisfactorily and fully explain the choice of this parable.

The Author points out that the passage in Matthew xx. 1-16 relates a conversation held about midwinter or January, whereas Matthew xxi. 28 and John xv. 2 were spoken in the middle of March. Wherein, then, lies the difference ? He very aptly quotes Mr. W. Carruthers, F.R.S., who writes, " For tilling the ground and keeping it free from weeds in winter, hired labour would be sufficient ; but for cutting off the rapidly growing shoots in March or later,

¹ That household slaves were a part of the family, and regarded as specially trustworthy servants, is a fact of immense importance in the study of ancient society.

so as to prevent the energy of the plant from being directed to mere vegetative development, an intelligent workman would be needed." The delicate labour of pruning must be intrusted to one who has both skill and interest in the result ; but unskilled labour was sufficient to turn over the soil and to destroy the weeds. Moreover, there is a great deal more of tedious labour involved in the latter ; and it must often have been necessary to get in more hands to do the winter work in the vineyard.

In both cases the illustration was drawn from what was actually being done at the moment. Speaker and hearers saw the suggestion of the parable taking place before their eyes, as the words were spoken. Similarly I have elsewhere tried to point out ¹ how inevitable it is that, when Christ said to Nicodemus " the wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the voice thereof, but knowest not whence it cometh and whither it goeth," the two were not in some cellar in Jerusalem but out on the side of the Mount of Olives, with the wind of spring moving gently around them. The character which is impressed on speech and thought by life in the open air is apt to escape the reader who is used to live and think and study and address audiences in a room ; for he often assumes unconsciously that scenes must have occurred in closed spaces, though something of the vitality is lost on this assumption. Part of what is called the Oriental character of the Bible should more correctly be called the open-air character.

These cases may be generalized as a principle. Those who live in the open air and draw their imagery from the visible phenomena of nature must be to a large extent guided in their choice by the present circumstances. A man who is sitting or walking in the open air and conversing is not likely to talk about the beautiful bloom of

¹ *The Education of Christ*, p. 74.

the fruit trees in an orchard close by, if the trees are bare in the winter season or loaded with fruit. If he talked of the beautiful flowers that clothe the trees, you know that the conversation occurred in the spring time. The careful reader can tell in many cases the time of the year when such illustrations were spoken, and thus a system of annual chronology can be established. Every reader of literature can illustrate this from his own experience or study. There are few commentators on any ancient author who have not sometimes employed reasoning of this class. Colonel Mackinlay's merit lies in employing it systematically and more thoroughly and with greater attention to the facts and habits of ancient Palestinian life and surroundings than any other person (so far as the present reviewer's knowledge extends), and in establishing on this basis, which is theoretically a perfectly sound one, a complete chronology of the life of Christ. In doing so he rests his reasoning on many acute and subtle observations, which are well worth careful reading.

This method of reasoning has, of course, its dangers and its defects. It is almost inevitable that the reasoner should press some of his observations too far, and should be too subtle and apt to take more from a passage than others (and especially the hasty reader) think it can stand. But there is always that danger in the cumulative method of reasoning: one brings in everything large or small that can add to the pile. I would illustrate this, and explain its limits, by quoting a parallel case.

Mr. Hobart has been blamed in the same way for bringing into his proof that the writer of the Acts and the Third Gospel was a physician many details which add little or nothing to the strength of his demonstration. This is quite true, and Mr. Hobart was as fully aware of it as any of his critics. But when the critics go on to maintain that

this detracts from the strength of his reasoning, they are altogether mistaking the character of cumulative evidence. The valuelessness of one detail, the lightness of one stone, does not take away from the strength and the weight of the other details, though it may annoy and mislead the hasty reader who judges by a sample and takes by chance, or by design, the poorest. Moreover, the critic who is accustomed to the more fascinating and brilliant method of deductive reasoning (in which, however, the weakness of even one link in the chain is fatal to the strength of the whole) is apt to forget that cumulative reasoning is not of the same kind. Each has its distinct character, its own separate merits and defects.

Accordingly, Colonel Mackinlay may lose in the reader's estimate many of his props, and yet retain enough to support an edifice which continues to stand and to be habitable. The subject is difficult and obscure ; and every attempt to reason out a new line of proof ought to be heartily welcomed. The reasoning in this case proceeds from a mind which assumes at starting the complete trustworthiness and perfect accuracy of the Gospels. This will at once discredit the book with many of the prejudiced and arbitrary class of scholars, whose mind is already completely made up and closed to any new evidence ; and it may be granted that the prejudice in the Author's mind does in some cases produce what I must call a certain weakness in the argument, where he abandons the cumulative method of observing details and facts, and proceeds to reason from general principles, as for example about the character and conduct and past life of the Magi in his chapter vii., in which he no longer stands on what can be considered firm or safe ground.

While the present reviewer is personally most interested in the thorough-going chronology of the life of Christ

month by month, or at least season by season and feast by feast, which the Author works out, it is certain that many, probably most, readers will follow with more lively interest his observations on the meaning of particular sayings and their relations to the surroundings of time, season, atmospheric phenomena and the position of the familiar stars. Although in regard to the phenomena of the heavens almost all interest in and knowledge of even the more striking stars has been lost in western society, yet the true scholar must try to place himself in the mental atmosphere of ancient Palestinian life, when a certain familiarity with some of the stars was possessed by all and was made an essential part of their thought and expression and was used as a guide in their ways and times of life. One or two examples may therefore be given of the class of observations on which the Author's system is founded.

When Christ saw Nathanael under the fig tree, this may be regarded as an indication of the summer season. In Matthew xxiv. 32, when the branch of the fig tree "is now become tender and putteth forth its leaves, ye know that the summer is nigh." The fading of the leaf of the fig tree is alluded to by Isaiah xxxiv. 4. Between those limits lay the scene when Nathanael retired under the fig tree. He was astonished that any one could see him, and therefore he must have been hid from view by the thick foliage. Moreover, the Author points out that he had evidently gone there to pray in quiet and secrecy, as "an Israelite without guile." This was about the beginning of the Ministry of Christ; the Baptism and the Temptation had already occurred; but there seems to have been no great interval between them. The Temptation apparently followed the Baptism immediately, and lasted forty days. The Author places these events in August and September.

Some time previously occurred the first appearance of

John the Baptist as a teacher. The Author points out that three expressions in his early teaching refer to the season : (1) " The axe is laid to the root of the tree " : the decision to cut down a useless tree would be taken later than the pruning season in March, when it was evident that the tree (possibly for the second season) was not productive. (2) " Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is cut down." This emphasizes the same allusion. Both point to April. (3) " Whose fan is in His hand and He will thoroughly cleanse His threshingfloor ; and He will gather His wheat into the garner." The season is harvest and the locality was the deep hot valley of the Jordan, where harvest was very early. The preaching of John, therefore, began to arrest the attention of the Jews in April and the time immediately following. After a certain interval, a few months probably, Jesus came to be baptized. As John passed like a meteor across the sky of Palestine, or rather like the Morning Star heralding the light of day, there is no reason to place the Baptism in a later year than the first appearance of John. On this point there is a practically universal agreement of opinion. All these events belong to the spring and summer and early autumn of the same year. Since the Baptist is so persistently regarded as the Morning Star, it must have been shining at his appearance and gladdening the eyes of the crowd of his followers every morning, marking him out as the Herald for whom the nation was looking, according to the prophecy of Malachi. The cycle of appearances of Venus as the Morning Star proves that this year was A.D. 25.

To take another example of the influence which the seasons and the state of agriculture exerted on the customs of the people among whom Christ lived and taught, we take one from the sphere of action and no longer from that of mere language. The Author points out on p. 120, that

at the feeding of the five thousand Jesus "commanded the multitude to sit down on the grass" (Matt. xiv. 19). To us who live in the moist lands of these islands this conveys no intimation of the time of year, but in the dry soil and under the hot sun of the Levant lands, it means that the season was spring. Only in spring is there grass, which withers early along with the flowers under the summer sun. This fact plays an important part in the economy of farm life; and the traveller is often reminded of it, when he seeks to hire horses at that season: they are all out at grass. A free life on the grass is regarded as necessary to their health and vigour. Their keep costs nothing during that time, but they cannot do hard work on grass. Hence the traveller, if he insists on getting horses in that season, must tempt the owners by a higher price. Such are the facts in Asia Minor, and I have no doubt that they are similar in Palestine.

The brief phrase which Matthew uses may seem to some—especially to those who have not had the opportunity of familiarizing themselves with the kind of thought and expression which arises from the rarity and value of grass in such countries—to be an insufficient basis to support the Author's inference as to the season. But, as he points out, Mark vi. 39 speaks of "the green grass," and John vi. 10 says "there was much grass in the place." Moreover John vi. 4 mentions that the time of the year was just before Passover.¹ The inference from the scanty phrase of Matthew is perfectly confirmed.

The Author points out well that this is the season of the year when bread is scarce and dear for people who live

¹ The inference from Mark and John is, of course, familiar and common, and has been used against Hort's unfortunate suggestion that τὸ Πάσχα in John vi. 4 is an interpolation. But my object is to demonstrate that the brief word of Matthew would alone be sufficient evidence, though I suppose that some Western scholars would have scouted such an assertion, if it were not supported by the clearer testimony of John and Mark.

on the fruits of their own soil and are not affected by imported grain. The produce of the last harvest is coming near an end, and is often exhausted or almost exhausted by this season, while the new harvest is coming on but is still useless. People have often to go hungry, and prices rise high. In this time of dearth the relief which Christ gave was really needed, for the villages (none of which were even near) would be also on the verge of famine.

While in this case the individual character of the scene and the suitability of the surrounding conditions are extremely well marked, one must observe that the details which give life to the incident are lacking in the story of the feeding of four thousand (Matt. xv. 32 ff., Mark viii. 1 ff.), except that there the people sit down on the ground : there was no longer grass to sit on at this season. But this is the general fact : the other scene gathers individuality and life from the unusual character of the circumstances.

But when the Author attempts to find an allusion to the varying seasons in Luke x. 3, "Lambs in the midst of wolves" (dated February or beginning of March), as compared with Matthew x. 16, "sheep in the midst of wolves" (in harvest time, about May, "the young sheep by this time would no longer be considered lambs"), I do not think his reasoning can be accepted. In my experience the term "lamb" is in Asiatic Turkey used for a young sheep at any season of the year, and any flesh of sheep that is sold as fit to eat is "lamb" ; and the flesh of a sheep in its second year is already coarse, and not considered eatable except by poor and hardy peasants.¹ Moreover, the Author himself dates the words of John the Baptist, "Behold the Lamb of God," in the autumn, whereas his principle would require a date about February to April.

¹ This is mentioned and illustrated in my *Impressions of Turkey*, p. 17.

The main feature of Colonel Mackinlay's book is its insistence on the importance of the Morning Star in the symbolism of the Gospels. Some of the references to this Star are so emphatic and distinct in the Gospels that they cannot be misunderstood. This species of symbolism was employed freely, as every reader knows, in the Gospels. The Author, however, shows that it was carried very much further than has been hitherto observed ; and some of the passages in which he detects the use of this symbolism gain much effect from his interpretation. John the Baptist was the Forerunner, the Morning Star. Christ was the Sun, the Light of the World. On p. 16 the Author protests against the mistaken idea in Holman's Hunt's picture, "The Light of the World," where Christ is represented as illuminating the world with a lantern. It was as the Sun that He illumined the world ; and He used the words about himself at the end of the Feast of Tabernacles, which "reminded the Jews of their deliverance from Egypt and of the Divine leading by the pillar of fire in the wilderness (Neh. ix. 1, 9, 12, 19)." At this Feast large lamps were "lighted in the Temple Court, which were reminders of the ancient guiding pillar of fire in the wilderness ; He said in effect, 'I am like the sun which gives light to all in the world,'—a greater blessing than the Hebrews had of old, when they followed the pillar of fire."

Similarly in John ix. 5, where "the Light of the World" is Christ, the allusion must be to the sun, for there is in the context a contrast between day and night. The Author also compares xi. 9, xii. 35 f., 46, i. 9, 1 John ii. 8, Luke i. 78, ii. 32, Acts xiii. 47, in all of which Christ is the Sun.

In the first chapter the Author is careful to show how much larger a part the Morning Star plays in the life and language of the peoples in the Levant lands than it does among the late-rising nations of the dark north. The

Morning Star begins the day for the nomads and the agriculturists of those southern regions, and even in the cities people work at a very early hour; in southern countries generally people rise very much earlier than they do in the cold northern lands; and, where artificial light is scanty and bad, few sit up long after dark, and there is less disposition to lie late in the morning. Moreover, where sunlight is abundant, there seems to be much less need for long sleep than in dark countries. The Author touches on the question whether the ancients knew that Venus, the Morning Star, assumes at times a crescent form (which they probably did), and how they acquired this knowledge. He is disposed to think that they sometimes employed artificial aids to vision, as a lens was found by Layard at Nemrud; and that the naked eye could not discover the crescent form, though people who know what to expect can see it or think they see it. But one of my friends, a distinguished Professor of Mathematics, tells me that the crescent form could be detected by any watcher of the skies, if he saw the planet against the edge of a sharp upright cliff. At any rate it is certain that the ancients "observed the planet with the utmost attention" and gave it a prominent place in their religion under the names Istar and Ashtaroth and Venus, and so on.

Now, just as John the Baptist about May-June A.D. 25 drew his illustrations from the harvest and the threshing-floors, which were busy at that season, and just as about December A.D. 27 the sowing which was busily going on all around suggested the parables in Matthew xiii. 3-32, Mark iv. 26-29, so the Author maintains that, when John preached, "He that cometh after me is mightier than I," drawing his idea from the Morning Star, herald of the Sun, that Star must have been in its morning phase at the time, guiding the conduct and plain to the eyes and touching

the minds of all his audience every day before dawn, when they rose at its summons. So with several other expressions, as, "he was the lamp that burneth and shineth" (John v. 35), "behold I send my messenger before thy face" (quoted in Matt. xi. 10).

Incidentally, we must notice that such accounts as those mentioned in the beginning of the preceding paragraph are not to be understood as reports of what John and Jesus said in one single speech. They should rather be taken as expressing the gist and marrow of the teaching at a certain period, as the general purport crystallized in the memory of certain auditors.

In the Apocalypse xxii. 16, Christ is called the Morning Star, but in the Gospels He is the Sun, while the Baptist is His Herald, an image taken from Malachi iii. 1, iv. 2, as seen in Luke i. 76, 78, Mark i. 2, Luke i. 17, John iii. 28, Matthew xi. 10, Luke vii. 27, Paul in Acts xiii. 24, John i. 7, 8, etc. The comparison in the Apocalypse belongs to a different period and another circle of thought. Its meaning may be illustrated by the expression in the letter to the Church at Thyatira, "he that overcometh . . . I will give him the Morning Star" (Rev. ii. 28). In this phrase there lies probably more than is allowed for in the *Letters to the Seven Churches of Asia*, p. 334. We must understand that the Star is the dawn of a brighter day and a new career. To the victor there shall be given the brightness and splendour and power that outshine the great Empire, and the promise of and entrance upon a higher life. It is the same thought as afterwards suggested the term *dies natalis* for the day on which a martyr died: this day was his birthday, on which he entered into a nobler life. After the same fashion Christ calls Himself in Revelation xxii. 16 the Morning Star, as the beginner and introducer of a new era. In the Gospels the point of view is so different as to show that they belong

to an earlier age and another style of thought, not contradictory, but the result of a new point of view.

In chapter vi., the Author discusses the length of Christ's Ministry, and concludes that it was three and a half years. It has long seemed to me that this was the true length ; and the shorter periods assigned by many scholars appeared to be based on misconceptions. The estimate of one year (or, more strictly, one year and some months) is due to misinterpretation of Luke iv. 19, where "the acceptable year of the Lord" is taken as the period of Christ's Ministry. This is an almost inexcusable error, for it supposes that the period of one year and several months could be called one year by the ancients. This period would have been called two years, according to the universal rule.¹ Some of the early Fathers, who were uninterested in and careless of chronological exactness, are responsible for this misinterpretation,² which ought not to survive when it is recognized that the Ministry must have lasted over at least two Passovers, together with some months before the first.

The Author passes over this estimate as requiring no notice, and inquires only into the possibility of the middle estimate that the Ministry lasted two years and a half. Besides the much debated question of the number of Passovers that occurred during the Ministry, he also discusses the number of Feasts of Tabernacles. In regard to the former question there is, of course, nothing new to be said. The arguments have all been already drawn out to endless length ; and the Author passes over them in a brief paragraph of seven lines. The latter question opens up a topic of considerable extent, on which the Author has much that is quite novel to say, and which he insists upon a great deal

¹ See the article on *Days, Months, Hours* in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. v.

² Clement of Alexandria and Origen both said so.

in other chapters also. He points out that the reading of Isaiah lxi. by Jesus in the synagogue at Nazareth must have taken place at the beginning of a year, at the beginning of a Sabbath year, and at the Feast of Tabernacles. His reasoning on this subject is extremely ingenious and interesting, and merits the most serious consideration. Chronologically, this would settle the question, if it finally stands scrutiny. My own impression is that it will establish itself ; but I may be prejudiced, as it confirms my own chronological views in all except one point, which is of merely speculative interest, viz., the year of Christ's birth. The length of Christ's Ministry and the year of His death are matters of the utmost importance for the right understanding and for the historical value of the Gospels ; but it makes little difference in those respects whether He was born in any year between 9 and 5 B.C. Colonel Mackinlay has maintained that the Birth was in 8 B.C. at the Feast of Tabernacles ; and he has advanced distinctly stronger arguments for this view than can be brought forward in favour of any other year. A date later than 5 B.C. would be fatal to the historicity of Matthew and Luke ; beyond that the date is a matter only of chronological importance.

It is a consequence of the very early date that the residence of the Holy Family in Egypt would have to be longer than is usually supposed ; but there is absolutely no ground in the words of Matthew to support any argument that the residence in Egypt could not have been so long as five and a third years, which is the period assigned by the Author.

The Sabbatical year necessarily began in the autumn. If it had begun in the spring, the beginning would have occurred after corn had been sowed, and the land could not have lain fallow for the year. It was necessarily implied in the idea of a Sabbatical year that it should begin at the

end of the annual cycle of agriculture and before the next annual cycle opened ; i.e. it must begin near the autumn equinox at the Feast of Tabernacles. This was fixed by the Law of Moses, whereas the ordinary conception of the year in the South-Syrian lands regarded it as beginning in spring.

The Author maintains that the Sabbatical year began at the Feast of Tabernacles in the autumn of A.D. 26.¹ This then was the time when the scene in the Synagogue at Nazareth occurred ; and Christ had been speaking in public previously for some time. The conclusion which I have reached as to the beginning of the Ministry (*Christ Born at Bethlehem*, p. 201) is that "in the later months of that year A.D. 25, John appeared announcing the coming of Christ, and very shortly thereafter Jesus came and was baptized by John in the river Jordan. Some months ² thereafter occurred the Passover on 21 March, A.D. 26." Colonel Mackinlay would place these events earlier by a few months. He leaves a longer interval between the appearance of John and of Jesus, viz. about four to five months ; and places the Baptism about 45 days before the Feast of Tabernacles A.D. 25. I see no objection to this, though the evidence is too slender to demonstrate it. Thus he finds the first two occurrences of this Feast within the Ministry.

The third Feast he places at the time of Matthew xii. 18-21 ; the Sabbatic year was now ended, and the period "of special invitation to the Jewish nation" was past. Now begins a new period ; and in the words quoted from Isaiah in this passage of Matthew Christ is twice described as the Saviour of the Gentiles.

¹ There is some controversy as to the exact series of Sabbatical years ; but the view which Colonel Mackinlay takes seems to be the right one.

² In the original text I printed "one or two months thereafter," but this was too precise, and I would substitute the vaguer expression.

The fourth Feast of Tabernacles, in the Author's scheme, synchronized with the Transfiguration, and this suggested to Peter's mind the idea of making the three tabernacles. The Transfiguration occurred "after the Passover of A.D. 28 (compare Matthew xiv. 14-21 and John vi. 4-13 with Matthew xvii. 2), but before the visit to the borders of Judæa beyond Jordan (Matthew xix. 1, John x. 40), which was probably about the beginning of January, A.D. 29 (see p. 54)." Now Jesus spent part of this Feast at Jerusalem (John vii. 14); but it is mentioned that He would not go up at the beginning of the Feast, but remained some days in Galilee, and appeared in Jerusalem, "when it was now the middle of the Feast," probably the fourth day.

If this dating, for which Colonel Mackinlay argues very plausibly, be accepted, several very interesting results follow, which he has not neglected to observe, and probably many more which fall outside the scope of his book. One topographical inference would be that the Mount of the Transfiguration could not be Mount Hermon (which always seemed to me very improbable and incongruous with ancient habits and ideas), but some mountain further south and nearer Jerusalem.

The Nativity also is placed by the Author at the Feast of Tabernacles. This seems highly probable, and may even, I think, be regarded as approximating to certainty. It has been pointed out frequently that the circumstances of the Birth are inconsistent with a winter date, for the sheep are folded at night in winter, whereas they were feeding out on the upland plains near Bethlehem on the night when Christ was born: that is the custom only during the hot season of the year. Considerable part of the summer is required for the operations of harvest and thrashing in various parts of Palestine, which take place earlier or later according to the elevation above the sea; and it would have been impossible

to order any movement of the people until those operations were fully completed. Accordingly the conclusion has been drawn, "we may say with considerable confidence that August to October is the period within which the numbering would be fixed" (*Christ Born at Bethlehem*, p. 193). Now at the Feast of Tabernacles there was always a considerable movement of the Jews from the northern parts towards Jerusalem; and it was natural that the king should avoid the disturbance caused by two movements near the same time, and make the numbering coincide with the Feast, only requiring that all should go up on this occasion to the town of Judæa, which was their original home. I have pointed out how necessary it was that the prejudices and customs of the Jews should not be interfered with; an Oriental despot may be extremely cruel without offending public feeling, and indeed may be all the more successful by virtue of his cruelty; but he must not run counter to the national genius and customs, and this Herod seems to have carefully refrained from doing. The journey to Jerusalem which many were undertaking at the autumn Feast could be combined with the enforced repairing of each to his own city, for it must be remembered that these northern Jews at this period were of the two tribes, not of the ten.

An interesting discovery has been made in Egypt bearing on this point: an order dated A.D. 104 that every Egyptian must repair to his own home in preparation for the numbering of the households. Mr. Kenyon and Mr. Bell append the following note to this document. "It is a rescript from the Prefect requiring all persons who were residing out of their own homes to return to their homes in view of the approaching census. The analogy between this order and Luke ii. 1-3 is obvious."¹

¹ *British Museum Papyri*, iii. p. 124. I am indebted to Professor J. H. Moulton in the *Expository Times*, October, 1907, p. 41, for directing

This may be taken as a parallel to the similar order at the first numbering in Palestine ; and it tends to show that when Herod issued his command, he was acting under Roman orders, and had no choice but to obey. It was not a device which he had chosen himself with his skill in kingcraft ; it was one that was forced on him, and which he had to carry into effect.

It is an unfortunate circumstance for the convincingness of the Author's argument that he states "harmonies" as if they were arguments. They are in his estimation and from his point of view arguments ; but in the modern view they have no value as proof. It would have been a wiser plan to separate the "harmonies" from the evidence. The harmonies are in some cases interesting, but, in view of the feeling in the Bible, what value could it have (even if proved) that Christ was baptized at a Full Moon ? Such "harmonies" are valueless coincidences.

The very idea of "harmonies," as Colonel Mackinlay works them out, will be found repellent by many minds. But his system of chronology rests, as I am strongly inclined to think, on a thoroughly sound basis of reasoning. One cannot yet say that the basis is certain. The subject is still too obscure and the evidence too scanty. But, in the words of Professor J. H. Moulton (in the passage just quoted), "We are getting on. One of the census papers of the Nativity year will turn up next." When the chronology is settled, the "harmonies" come in as very noteworthy coincidences, in which there may be more than can be yet comprehended : the whole structure may be

my attention to this important document. Previously I had been inclined to think that the method of carrying out the enumeration on the principle that each man should be counted in his own city might have originated from Herod. This possibility is now definitely eliminated. The method was Roman, and the origin may therefore be assigned with perfect confidence, as Luke assigns it, to the Emperor.

compared to that of the Great Pyramid, in the construction of which astronomical facts certainly played a part, though it is not easy to determine where design ends and coincidence begins.

It becomes only more clear to the reader of this book that the Gospels are a remarkable structure, resting on fact and observation, and full of the sort of detail which can originate only in reality. The first two chapters of Luke stand the test which the Author has been unconsciously applying much better than the first two chapters of Matthew, as furnishing far more of the illustrations which he collects. The last chapter of the book, however, does not add to its effect as a whole.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE TEACHING OF EDWARD IRVING.

ON the far horizon of early life lie the facts which connect me personally with Edward Irving. Memory preserves the form and features of three persons intimately connected with the early days of that movement, which issued in what by a bewildered clerk in tabulating the returns of the last religious census was first called the Catholic Apostolic Church. This name was a mistake. The members themselves desired only to be known as belonging to "a congregation of the Catholic and Apostolic Church worshipping in Newman Street." None of the three I have mentioned ever joined that congregation. One of them, my own grandmother, sat regularly under Irving both at Hatton Garden and in Regent Square, my grandfather having been one of the committee who called the young helper from St. John's, Glasgow, to preside over the Scots congregation in London. Of her my recollections are peculiarly vivid. I was but seven when she died, yet the

Te Deum and the 64th paraphrase, "To Him that lov'd the souls of men," are always closely associated in my mind with her memory. To her I owe my first knowledge of the Logos. She, together with William Pennefather, founder of the Mildmay Conference, with whom her later years were associated, and to whom I owe my baptism, gave me my earliest conception of the saint.

I mention these facts, because my object is to gain for Edward Irving more justice than is usually allowed him as a maker of Christian Thought and an exponent of the Faith of the New Testament ; and I want to show that I have some right to speak. But my claim carries me yet further than I have indicated. In my possession is a perfect wilderness of manuscripts dealing with the inner history of the movement in the Twenties and Thirties. Both my grandparents kept journals with more or less regularity. There is a letter of 1824 in the handwriting of Irving's wife, Isabella Martin of Kirkcaldy, the last few words and signature being added by the great preacher himself, in which the duties of an elder are set forth and the office pressed upon my grandfather. There is the copy of another letter on the subject of certain day schools in which Irving declares that "every teacher of children should have taken upon himself the vows of Christ." There are letters on spiritual subjects from and to the McDonalds, the ship-building family of Port Glasgow, who were the centre of a "gifted" circle on the Clyde, intimately associated with the congregation in London. There is another letter of William Caird, dated from Albany Park and telling about his wife, the Mary Campbell who with her sister Isabella belonged to McLeod Campbell's parish of Row, and who form the subject of reminiscences by Robert Story of Rosneath. Most interesting of all, perhaps, is a document endorsed with the words : "I believe this utterance was

given through Margaret Macdonald." It includes at one point the indication of a "tongue." The paper is torn, the ink faded, and the writing hurried and difficult. But the style is oracular, and the "message," starting from the fact of "the mighty God in the womb of the Virgin Mother," purports to declare the true position of woman as near to "the Man upon the Throne of God," though always subordinate as "the weaker vessel" and the author of the Fall. It is no doubt intended as a warning against the feminine influence under which, as some believed, Irving was being led astray. I speak under correction, but my impression is that the "Twelve Apostles" were the result of the utterance of a "prophetess."

It must be understood that the view of Irving's teaching here to be presented depends on an independent study of the subject, based to a large extent upon these unpublished writings. They are used as a key to his published works.

But there are one or two things which should first be made clear. One is that no sort of impression of Irving is to be gained from the *éloge* of Mrs. Oliphant. My grandmother, who must have known him very well indeed, used always to say that the biography entirely misrepresented him. When some years ago, in the light of previous knowledge, I read the book for myself, I entirely endorsed this view. It was quite obvious that the novelist, who ventured to write his life, had not the necessary equipment for a scientific treatment of her subject, for she had neither sympathy with his spirit nor insight into his teaching. To her nothing appealed but the brilliant eloquence and the fervent character of the man, his meteoric course and clouded ending. His story exhibited the elements of tragedy. It was almost a merit that he should accomplish nothing. But Irving must be taken seriously, if his place in the history of religious thought is to be duly recognized.

On the other hand, not much reliance can be placed on the criticism of Sir Walter Scott. It will be remembered how Lockhart records an entry in the Diary for 1829, in which Sir Walter mentions his meeting with Irving, telling how "he spoke with that kind of unction which is nearly allied to cajolerie" and how with his generally fine appearance and obliquity of vision he seemed like "the devil disguised as an angel of light." Shakespeare never drew a saint, nor was Scott, with all his wide powers of observation, the man to do justice to the qualities that make the seer. That Irving was not beyond the reach of human frailties goes without saying. But I am bound to say that my authorities, who belonged to a party ultimately rejected by Irving and who would therefore not be slow to detect fundamental insincerity, never betray suspicion of vanity or insincerity, but uniformly attribute what they regard as his failure to influences outside the man himself. And I am much more ready to accept the judgment of an observer like Thomas Erskine of Linlathen. "He has been a remarkable man in a remarkable age. He was a man of much childlike feeling to God, and personal dependence on Him, among things which may well appear unintelligible and strange in his history."

One other point deserves notice. In one of my journals an account is given of a pastoral visit paid to the household of the author. "Mr. Irving asked my opinion of Mr. Hall of Leicester. He considers him too argumentative. Mr. Irving says that he himself is desirous of preaching extempore and after the style of Baxter and the ministers of his day." Any one who remembers the Addisonian English of Robert Hall, his affinities with Burke, his sympathies with Eighteenth Century Reason, will readily appreciate Irving's point of departure from the preceding age. He is a romantic, a prophet, a seer. His appeal is to the spiritual man. Here

is the explanation of the fact that the middle classes of Glasgow, who idolized Chalmers, had no use for his assistant. They wanted sermons on "The influence of Christianity in aiding and augmenting the Mercantile Virtues." Orations on the great looming mysteries of the universe only bored them. But it is true that Irving, like Wordsworth, had no humour. And this was his undoing.

We must now turn to an examination of the teaching with which Irving sought to meet the needs of his time. The spirit of the eighteenth century was not wholly a thing of the past. Formalism and conventionality still reigned. The ethical and vital side of religion, its supreme importance as the mould of human character, was only dimly realized. Moderatism regarded the Christian Faith as a prop to civil government and morality. The Evangelical preached a mechanical salvation, whose one-sidedness and externality were tending to make the doctrine of substitution as non-moral, if not immoral, as the mediaeval system of masses. This was the state of things which Irving had to face; and he did so by bringing into the forefront of his teaching and doctrine of the Incarnation, and the expectation of the Second Coming.

The teaching which concerned the Incarnation was developed first. It should be remembered that it preceded by several years the Oxford movement, on the lines of which Irving advanced, more confused, more misty, less systematic, but dominated by the same principle. Here is a notable passage from the Advertisement to the Oxford Tracts, bearing the date, All Saints, 1834:—

The following tracts were published with the object of contributing something towards the practical revival of doctrines which, although held by the great divines of our Church, *at present have become obsolete with the majority of her members, and are withdrawn from the public view even by the more learned and orthodox few who still adhere to them.*

Compare the preface to the *Oracles of God*, Irving's first book, published in 1823 :—

It hath appeared to the author of this book, from more than ten years' meditation upon the subject, that the chief obstacle to the progress of divine truth over the minds of men is *the want of its being properly presented to them*. In this Christian country there are, perhaps, *nine-tenths of every class who know nothing at all about the applications and advantages of the single truths of revelation, or of revelation taken as a whole* ; and what they do not know they cannot be expected to reverence or obey. This ignorance, in both the higher and lower orders, of Religion, as a discerner of the thoughts and intentions of the heart, is not so much due to the want of inquisitiveness on their part, as to *the want of a sedulous and skilful ministry on the part of those to whom it is entrusted*.

The object which Irving, no less than the Oxford reformers, set before himself was nothing else but to revive and press upon the public attention forgotten truths of dogmatic religion, as supremely affecting human life, and to revive those deeper aspects of the faith which an Erastian age had allowed to lapse into practical oblivion.

The argument of *Judgment to Come*, which forms a portion of Irving's first volume, states the problem of the time as it appeared to the young minister of the Caledonian Church. First he notices the passionless morality of the learned, with their cold maxims and contempt of faith and enthusiasm :—

Oh, that the spirit of the antients would rise again and ashame these modern men, who go dreaming in universities over a philosophy which hath no kernel of nourishing food, a philosophy of mind they call it, but it is a mind without a heart,—who go wearying the dull ear of senates with talk about Law, and jargon about the moral government of men, while in all their researches after wisdom and government they see no form nor comeliness in the institutes of God, and hear no music to enchant them in the Gospel of Christ, though it poureth the full diapason of harmony into the heart of man.

Like the Oxford School, he was the sworn foe of Philistinism :—

I know how boon Nature of herself hath suggested deeds which blaze through dark ages like stars in the vault of night, and I know

how bountiful a mother she is still in bearing sons and daughters strong in virtue and desirous of glory. But I know as well how "they come to their own, and their own acknowledge them not."

Again, like the Tractarians, he dreads the rising Liberalism :—

Truly they do but babble about liberty and reformation, who think that the depressed condition of a people can be elevated to its proper place by political means alone. The perfection of civil polity is to defend, not to guide mankind.

This, then, was Irving's world—cold, moderate, middle class, developing the liberalism which Keble and Pusey and Newman feared, and tending in its education and general view of life to a practical materialism. Some of the enthusiasm of the old evangelical party still remained, but its theology was hopelessly unable to cope with the widening intelligence and larger interests of the time. The idea of substitution, which lies at the bottom of the truest and most living aspect of the work of Christ, had been so distorted by the mechanical and forensic method of stating the doctrine of the Atonement, that it repelled rather than attracted the finer minds.

In his pamphlet on the *Orthodox and Catholic Doctrine of our Lord's Human Nature* (1830) Irving comments as follows upon the objection raised to his teaching on the ground that it detracted from the merit of the Saviour's sufferings :—

There is a third objection, which is generally put in this form : And wherein then lay the great meritoriousness of Christ's sufferings ? To which question, the answer generally given is, That they procured God's favour, pacified him, and made him placable. This goes exactly upon the notion of the heathen, that God wanteth and will have suffering, wanteth and will have compensation, standeth to his point, and will not abate one iota of suffering to any one. And as he had a mind to save so many, Christ came and bore the sufferings which they might have borne ; every jot of it, but not one jot more : for if he had borne one jot more, the Father would have been unjust, and if he had borne one jot less, the Father would have abated of his sternest rectitude. . . . Such is the system of theo-

logy, or rather the one false view of a great truth, which hath swallowed up all theology and upon which are constructed the greater part of the sermons with which the Evangelical part of the church are nourished, or rather poisoned.

Such was Irving's view of that technical evangelicalism which has no echo in the heart. His own doctrine is aglow with life, bursting with energy, quickening flesh and soul and conscience at every point. The journal already quoted gives summaries of sermons preached from time to time in Hatton Garden or at Regent Square. Irving is never tired of recurring again and again to the central thought of the real humanity of our Lord. The following entries of the year 1825 may be taken as examples :

(1) This day Mr. Irving continued his discourse on the influence of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit necessary in man's conversion and in the general providence of God. The flesh was weak and unable to fulfil the Law. Therefore Christ came and condemned sin in the flesh, and gave us a victory over death. In the evening discourse he gave us his view of the true use and character of miracles. He thinks it is a low way of estimating the truth and character of the Christian religion to adduce the miracles wrought by Christ and his disciples.

(2) The Trinity is not merely a doctrine revealed in the word of God, but the whole Scripture is a history and embodying of the dealings of the Three Persons with mankind ; the Father willeth, the Son declareth and manifesteth, and the Holy Spirit sanctifieth and worketh in us all holy thoughts.

This sort of teaching, delivered with burning eloquence and enthusiasm, rapidly produced its results in many minds and characters. I take the following from the *Quarterly Journal of Prophecy*, a review published in the early seventies by Nisbet and edited, I believe, by Horatius Bonar. The writer is my grandmother, and she is describing phases of spiritual experience under the influence of Irving's teaching :

I must be made a new creature, after His own image, holy as He is holy, pure as He is pure, like unto Jesus my ever-blessed Lord. . . . I must die so that Christ might live in me. Imparted holiness was what, in my heart, I desired and prayed for continually. . . . I saw Jesus perfectly holy in my nature, and I believed He could

make me holy too. I saw His glory would be shown forth in making the unclean clean, the unholy holy like Himself; His own life in the creature flowing from Himself into the members of His body, being washed in His blood and clothed in His imputed righteousness.

What are the leading thoughts of this passage?

Surely vital union with Christ; human nature divinised by incorporation into Him. All this is involved in the faith that the Son of God became man and was made wholly like to us. This is the burthen of Irving's *Sermons on the Incarnation*, a volume which involved him in the charge of heresy. His error, as I am inclined to believe, was philosophical rather than strictly theological, depending on a confusion which sometimes tended to attribute evil to the flesh rather than to the will. Had I been a member of the Annan presbytery, I think I should on the whole have acquitted the accused on this indictment. But nevertheless it afforded a handle to the orthodox whose own teaching was far less true and living than that of the man whom they condemned.

The transition from high doctrine on the Person of Christ to a high conception of the Church is easy and natural. It is the passage from the Epistle to the Colossians to the Epistle to the Ephesians. The head of the woman is the man, the head of Christ is God. The head of the woman is the man, the head of the Church is Christ. That is the true theological sequence. And so about 1830 we find Irving preaching largely from the Ephesian Epistle, expounding the nature of the Church, and dwelling on the reality of the Christ-life imparted through this divine channel. He had always taken a high view of the Church. As a minister of the Established Church of Scotland he had subscribed the Confession of Faith, with the xxvth chapter of which he believed that "Unto this catholick visible church Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints." To him this had never been a mere matter of form. In his writings he always uses

the word "churchman" as opposed to "sectary," and the idea of his own ministerial office from the first was that of a patriarchal priesthood of blessing, a conception which still lives among Free Church ministers of the old school in the Highlands. In 1831 I find him describing himself as "angel" of the Church at Regent Square and as such claiming obedience from a member of the congregation. With the Westminster Confession, chap. xxviii., he held that in baptism the grace promised is not only offered, but "really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost"; with the chapter on the Lord's Supper, that "In this sacrament [there is made] a commemoration of that one offering up of Himself, by Himself, upon the Cross, once for all, and a spiritual oblation of all possible praise unto God for the same, and that worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed . . . receive and feed upon Christ Crucified." Such is the teaching of the formularies of the Established Church of Scotland. As such Irving had received it, and the germ of his subsequent preaching was virtually contained in it. It is not difficult to see how, as the sense of the overshadowing presence of the Spirit came to be more intensely accepted, the teaching began to take a definite shape. If there is grace in the Church, why not gifts of grace?

It was in 1831 that Mrs. Caird (Mary Campbell) with her husband visited London, impressed Irving and many of his people with the reality of her "gift," and thus formed the link between the manifestations at Port Glasgow and on the Gareloch with the prophecies and tongues which now appeared in the National Scots congregation in London and which its pastor felt constrained to "call into the Church." From this time until the condemnation of Irving by the London Presbytery there was always "the prophets'

seat," occupied largely, if not exclusively, by women, the occasion of those scenes of disorder which caused such scandal to the more phlegmatic Scotsmen of the session.

But it has never been generally recognized, no reader of Mrs. Oliphant would suppose, that the struggle which ensued was not confined, on the one hand, to the party which carried forward the movement till the "Catholic Apostolic Church" was a realized fact, and on the other to the old-fashioned Presbyterians who saw nothing but extravagant fanaticism in the very idea of spiritual gifts. There were others, and the McDonalds of Port Glasgow were among them, who were in the fullest sympathy with the principles of Biblical interpretation upon which the expectation of spiritual manifestations was based. Some were themselves subjects of these manifestations, but urged that the spirits of the prophets were subject to the prophets, that Irving failed not because he recognized but because he did not discriminate between the spirits, and allowed himself to be dominated by the utterances of "gifted" women, whom as pastor of the congregation he ought rather to have controlled. It is of the utmost importance not to neglect the fact that the later phases of what is popularly called Irvingism do not represent the whole of the movement, which is not therefore to be judged entirely by them. If it be true, as is undoubtedly the case, that the developments, to which Irving's teaching led, were deprecated by some of those who "spoke with tongues," no less than by others who distrusted the phenomena entirely, it manifestly becomes possible to assert that he was led astray by "lying spirits" instead of being deluded by a mere imagination of spiritual influence. I must not, however, be understood as affirming that such was the case on the evidence of what after all are *ex parte* statements.

It now becomes necessary to attempt to estimate the

value of what must always be considered an essential part of Irving's teaching, namely his interpretation of the prophetic element in Scripture and the Second Advent. So early as 1826 he had published a discourse extending to two volumes entitled *Babylon and Infidelity fore-doomed of God*. He was a member for some years of the prophetic conferences held in Mr. Drummond's house at Albury Park, where among others he associated with Hugh McNeile. That he expected the near approach of the Second Coming is, of course, unquestioned. But apart from this he felt the peculiar importance of these prophetic studies. "The events contained in the prophecies," he says, "are therefore not only a most important, but, if there be any difference, the most important part of the revelation of God; as the time of harvest and of the vintage is the most important season of the year." As then in the case of the spiritual gifts it is necessary to draw a careful distinction between Irving's teaching and the particular direction in which he was led, so in this matter of the Second Advent we must again distinguish. He revived the Parousia as the definite hope of the Church, which witnesses to the Lord's death "till He come."

This is the real point of difference between Irving's theology and that revived study of the Incarnation which characterized the nineteenth century generally. And here he is surely truer to the New Testament than Pusey and his successors or Westcott and his school. The Alexandrian theology of the fourth century, while suppressing much that was extravagant in Millenarianism, ignored a real element in the apostolic teaching when it developed the Christian Gnostic doctrine of the Logos at the expense of the prophetic side of the New Testament. Athanasius might give due prominence to the idea of redemption as conditioning the revelation of the incarnate Logos, but

the trend of the Cappadocians was towards an unpractical religious philosophy. Nor can we fail to trace a similar tendency in modern theology for atonement to give way before incarnation, a perfectly Biblical doctrine of divine immanence to shade off into a teaching that is practically indistinguishable from pantheism, amounting to a denial that "Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." In the New Testament the true proportion of faith is maintained by insisting not only on the concrete experience of the past, "that which our hands handled," but also on the concrete hope of the future, the manifestation and coming when "we shall see Him as He is." This is characteristic of the First Epistle of St. John no less than of the Apocalypse, of the Pastoral Epistles as well as of 1st and 2nd Thessalonians. Every group of the Pauline Epistles is alive with the joy of the Advent. Jude and 2 Peter glow with its heat. The expectation was not lost to the Church till Dionysius of Alexandria stifled it with his Platonism. Nor has there been wanting a continuous stream of witness all down the ages. But it has been the Dies Irae presented as a warning to sinners rather than the Reign of Christ offered to the hope of the saints. Michael Angelo's cartoon in the Sistine Chapel, with its weird and awful grandeur, is scarcely appropriate as an invitation to the Table of the Lord.

Now we may claim for Irving that he was a powerful, if too much neglected, witness to the true balance of New Testament teaching in the nineteenth century. Its theology is not a mere philosophy of the facts of the Gospel. There are passages of true *προφητεία* in St. Paul's arguments (1 Cor. xv. 51, 52; Phil. iii. 20, 21; 1 Thess. iv. 15-17; 2 Thess. ii. 3, 4; 2 Tim. iii. 1-5). The "Word of God" has His place not only in the Fourth Gospel but in Revelation. It is the great merit of Irving that he was keenly alive to both sides of the apostolic teaching. Nor is it unconnected

with this fact that there is no tendency to explain away the Atonement. The adoration of the Lamb "who loved the souls of men and washed them in His Blood" was what I was taught in my young days. It was here, as I now see, that another school, to which I owe an immense debt, was singularly defective. The writers of *Lux Mundi* passed from the Incarnation to the "extension of the Incarnation." The Atonement they were mainly concerned to explain. There is a strange and unsatisfying inadequacy in the late R. C. Moberly's *Atonement and Personality*. Is there not a real connexion between failure to appreciate the Scriptural presentation of the Death of Christ and the practical neglect of the "blessed hope and appearing of our great God and Saviour"?

But if Gnosticism is always hovering about Christology, Montanism is the ever present danger of apocalypse. As in the matter of the spirits, so here Irving displayed a characteristic weakness in submitting his intelligence to minds in every way inferior to his own. As early as 1826 he was induced to accept the system of apocalyptic interpretation of a gentleman whose only title to fame is his influence over the celebrated preacher. I cannot but suppose that Mr. Hatley Frere, who had otherwise little chance of winning acceptance for his prophetic view, set himself to capture Irving as an instrument for propagating his method. Mrs. Oliphant, in her accustomed manner, attributes this weakness in her hero to the "glamour in his eyes," in other words his romantic idealism, which "invariably elevated every man he talked with into the ideal man he ought to have been." This may be so. But it may just as well have been the result of the "humility and childlike simplicity" to which at a later date my grandmother ascribed what seemed to her his false steps. At any rate he whose power had been that he saw great ideas looming through the

mist, became in the matter of unfulfilled prophecy definite even to fantastic exactness, and thus added the movement which bears his name to the list, not of great achievements, but of brilliant failures.

“Now was the time of harvest”—so thought Edward Irving. “Mr Irving thinks,” says our journal, “that the coming of the Lord will take place in thirty years.” So he began to busy himself with Armageddons and Men of Sin, with Scarlet Women and Little Horns, till at length he almost seemed to catch the first streaks of the fiery dawn of the great and terrible day. Surely these revived gifts of the Spirit were the cry to go forth to meet the bridegroom, these prophetic voices were giving forth plain and unmistakable directions for the reaping of the world’s harvest. So for himself the practical outcome of his teaching, while witnessing to much that the Church had forgotten and needed to revive, was to follow his disciples out into the wilderness, there to build with the desert sand and to pursue wandering fires.

J. G. SIMPSON.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

I.

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE QUESTION.

A RESTATEMENT of the grounds of belief in the great fact of the Lord’s Resurrection seems called for in view of the changed forms of assault on this article of the Christian faith in recent years. It is difficult, indeed, to isolate this particular fact, outstanding as it is, from its context in the Gospel history taken as a whole, every point in which is made subject to a like minute and searching criticism. On the other hand, the consideration of the evidence for the Resurrection may furnish a vantage ground for forming a better estimate of the value of the methods by which

much of the hostile criticism of the Gospels is at present carried on.

As preliminary to the inquiry, it is desirable that a survey should be taken of the changed lights in which the question appears in past and in contemporary thought.

Time was, not so far removed, when the Resurrection of Jesus was regarded as an immovable corner-stone of Christianity. A scholar and historian like the late Dr. Arnold, of Rugby, summed up a general belief when he wrote : " I have been used for many years to study the history of other times, and to examine and weigh the evidence of those who have written about them ; and I know of no fact in the history of mankind which is proved by better and fuller evidence of every sort, to the understanding of a fair inquirer, than the great sign which God has given us, that Christ died and rose again from the dead." ¹ It will be recognized by any one familiar with the signs of the times that this language could not be employed about the state of belief to-day.

It was not that this article of Christian belief had not been long enough and violently enough assailed. The Resurrection of Jesus has been a subject of controversy in all ages. The story which St. Matthew tells us was in circulation among the Jews " until this day " ²—that the disciples had *stolen* the body of Jesus—was still spread abroad in the days of Justin Martyr. ³ It re-appears in that grotesque mediæval concoction, the *Toledoth Jeschu*. ⁴ Celsus, whom Origen combats, ridicules the Christian belief, and, with modern acuteness, urges the contradictions in the Gospel narratives. ⁵ Deistical writers, as Woolston and Chubb,

¹ Sermon on the Sign of the Prophet Jonas.

² Matt. xxviii. 15.

³ *Dial. with Trypho*, 108.

⁴ With some difference, in both the Wagenseil (1681) and the Huldreich (1705) recensions.

⁵ Origen, *Against Celsus*, ii. 56–63 ; v. 56, 58.

made the Resurrection a chief object of their attacks.¹ On the Continent, from Reimarus to Strauss, the stream of destructive or evasive ² criticism was kept up. Strauss must be regarded as the most trenchant and remorseless of the assailants even to the present hour.³ What escaped his notice in criticism of the narratives is not likely to have much force now. If, therefore, faith in the Resurrection till recently remained unshaken, it was not because the belief was not contested, but because of the confident conviction that the attack all along the line had failed. Other elements in the Gospel tradition might be doubtful, but here, it was supposed, was a rock on which the most timorous might plant his feet without fear. Details in the Resurrection narratives themselves might be, probably were, inaccurate ; but the central facts—the empty grave, the message to the women, the appearances to the disciples, sustained as these were by the independent witness of Paul in 1 Corinthians xv. 7, the belief of the whole Apostolic church—stood secure. This temper of certainty is excellently reflected in the Apologetic textbooks of the most recent period. In these the discussion travels along fixed and familiar lines—theories of imposture, of swoon, of subjective hallucination or visions, of objective but *spiritual* manifestations, all triumphantly refuted, and leaving the way open for the only remaining hypothesis, viz., that the event in dispute actually happened.

It is not suggested that Apologetic, up to this recent point, had failed in its main object, or that its confidence

¹ Replied to by Sherlock, West, Paley, etc.

² Several writers in this period advocated the theory that Christ's death was only a case of swoon or suspended animation (thus Paulus, Schleiermacher, Hase, etc.). Strauss may be credited with having given this theory its death-blow. See his *New Life of Jesus* (E.T.), i. pp. 13–32 ; 408–12.

³ For the full strength of Strauss's criticism the original *Life of Jesus* (1835) should be consulted.

in the soundness of its grounds for belief in the Resurrection was misplaced. It is not implied, even, that the evidence which sufficed then is not adequate to sustain faith now. It may turn out that it is, and that in the *essence* of both attack and defence less is really changed than the modern man supposes. Still even the casual observer cannot fail to perceive that, in important respects, the state of the controversy is very different to-day from what it was, say, fifteen or twenty years ago. Forces which were then only gathering strength, or beginning to make themselves felt, have now come to a head, and the old grounds for belief, and the old answers to objections, are no longer allowed to pass unchallenged. The evidence for the Resurrection may be much what it has been for the last nineteen centuries, but the temper of the age in dealing with that evidence has undeniably altered. The subject is approached from new sides, with new presuppositions, with new critical methods and apparatus, with a wider outlook on the religious history of mankind, and a better understanding, derived from comparative study, of the growth of religious myths; and, in the light of this new knowledge, it is confidently affirmed that the old defences are obsolete, and that it is no longer open to the instructed intelligence—"the modern mind," as it is named—to entertain even the possibility of the bodily Resurrection of Christ from the grave. The believer in this divine fact, accordingly, is anew put on his defence, and must speak to purpose, if he does not wish to see the ground taken away from beneath his feet.

It has already been hinted, and will subsequently become more fully apparent, that the consideration of Christ's Resurrection cannot be dissociated from the view taken of the facts which make up the Gospel history as a whole. This should be frankly acknowledged on both sides at the outset. Christ is not divided. The Gospel story cannot

be dealt with piecemeal. The Resurrection brings its powerful attestation to the claims made by Jesus in His earthly ministry ; ¹ but the claim to Messiahship and divine Sonship, on the other hand, with all the evidence in the Gospels that supports it, must be taken into account when we are judging of the reasonableness and probability of the Resurrection. No one can, even if he would, approach this subject without some prepossessions on the character, claims, and religious significance of Jesus, derived from the previous study of the records of His life, or, going deeper, from the presuppositions which have governed even that study. The believer's presupposition is Christ. If Christ was what His Church has hitherto believed Him to be—the divine Son and Saviour of the world—there is no antecedent presumption against His Resurrection ; rather it is incredible that He should have remained the prey of death.² If a lower estimate is taken of Christ, the historical evidence for the Resurrection will assume a different aspect. It will then remain to be seen which estimate of Christ most entirely fits in with the totality of the facts. On that basis the question may safely be brought to an issue.

This leads to the remark that it is really this question of *the admissibility of the supernatural* in the form of miracle which lies at the bottom of the whole investigation. The repugnance to miracle which is so marked a characteristic of the “modern” criticism of the Gospels can hardly, without an ignoring of the course of discussion for at least the last century and a half, be spoken of as a “new” thing. It underlay the rationalism of the older period, and some of the most stinging words in Strauss's *Life of Jesus* are directed against the abortive attempts of well-meaning mediating theologians to evade this fundamental

¹ Rom. i. 4.

² Acts ii. 24.

issue. Strauss's own position is made clear beyond possibility of mistake, and anticipates everything the "modern" man has to urge on the subject. "Our modern world," he says, "after many centuries of tedious research, has attained a conviction that all things are linked together by a chain of causes and effects, which suffers no interruption. . . . The totality of things forms a vast circle, which, except that it owes its existence and laws to a superior power, suffers no intrusion from without. This conviction is so much a habit of thought with the modern world, that in actual life the belief in a supernatural manifestation, an immediate divine agency, is at once attributed to ignorance and imposture."¹ Strauss at this stage is persuaded that "the essence of the Christian faith is perfectly independent of his criticism"; that "the supernatural birth of Christ, His miracles, His resurrection and ascension, remain eternal truths, whatever doubts may be cast on their reality as historical facts"; and that "the dogmatic significance of the life of Jesus remains inviolate."² At a later period, in his book on *The Old and the New Faith*, he reached the true gravitation-level of his speculations, and in answer to the question, "Are we still Christians?" boldly answered "No."³

The "modern" man has thus no reason to plume himself on his denial of miracle as a brand-new product of the scientific temper of the age in which he lives. His "modernity" goes back a long way in its negations. What is to be admitted is that the magnificent advance of the sciences during the past century has accentuated and reinforced this temper of distrust (or positive denial) of the miraculous; has given it greater precision and wider diffusion; has fur-

¹ The words are from the fourth edition (1840) of the (older) *Life of Jesus* (E.T.), i. p. 71.

² Ibid. Pref. p. xi.

³ In 1872.

nished it with new and plausible reasons, and made it more formidable as a practical force to be encountered. There is no doubt, in any case, that this spirit rules in a large proportion of the works recently issued on the Gospels and on the life of Christ, and is the concealed or avowed premiss of their treatment of the miraculous element in Christ's history, and notably of His resurrection.¹ The same temper has insensibly spread through a large part of the Christian community. Dr. Sanday truly enough describes "the attitude of many a loyal Christian" when he says that "he [the Christian] accepts the narratives of miracles and of the miraculous as they stand, but with a note of interrogation."² Others frankly reject them altogether. A chief difficulty in dealing with this widely-spread tendency is that it is, in most cases, less the result of reasoning than, as just said, a "temper," due to what Mr. Balfour would call "a psychological climate,"³ or Lecky would describe as "the general intellectual condition" of the time.⁴ Still, it is only by fair reasoning, and the adducing of considerations which set things in a different light, that it can be legitimately met; apart, that is, from a change in the "climate" itself, a thing continually happening. When this is done, it is remarkable how little, in the end, it is able to say in justification of its sweeping assumptions.

It is not only, however, in the general temper of the

¹ One may name almost at random such writers as A. Sabatier, Harnack, Pfleiderer, Wernle, Weinel, Wrede, Wellhausen, Schmiedel, Bousset, Neumann, O. Holtzmann, E. Carpenter, Percy Gardner, G. B. Foster (Chicago), N. Schmidt, K. Lake, etc.

² *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 103.

³ "A psychological 'atmosphere' or 'climate' favourable to the life of certain modes of belief, unfavourable, and even fatal, to the life of others."—*Foundations of Belief*, fourth edition, p. 218.

⁴ See the "Introduction" to Lecky's *History of Rationalism in Europe*, and his interesting summary of the causes of "The Declining Sense of the Miraculous" in the close of chap. ii. of that work.

time that a change has taken place in the treatment of our subject ; the new spirit has armed itself with new weapons, and, first of all, with those supplied to it in the methods and results of the *later textual and historical criticism*. Even the tyro cannot be unaware of the almost revolutionary changes wrought in the forms and methods of New Testament criticism—following in the wake of Old Testament criticism¹—within the last generation. There is, to begin with, an enormous increase in the materials of criticism, with its results in greater specialization and increased urgency in the demand for a many-sided equipment in the textual critic, commentator, and historical writer.² Then, with extension of knowledge, has come a sharpening of intelligence and increased stringency of method—a painstakingness in research, an attention to detail, aptitude in seizing points of relation and contrast, skill in disentangling difficulties, fertility in suggestion—above all, a boldness and enterprise in speculation³—which leave the older and more cautious scholarship far in the rear. Doubtless, if the Resurrection be a truth, the application of these stricter methods should only make the truth the more apparent. But it is obvious also that, for those who care to use them in that way, the methods furnish ready aids for the disintegration of the text and evaporation of its historical contents. If a passage for any reason is distasteful, the resources in the critical arsenal are boundless for getting it out of the way. There is slight textual variation, some MS. or version omits or alters, the Evangelists

¹ It is a sign of the times that Old Testament scholars like Wellhausen and Gunkel are now transferring their attentions to the New Testament.

² See the remarkable catalogue of qualifications for the commentator set forth in the Preface to Mr. W. C. Allen's new commentary on St. Matthew (*Intern. Crit. Com.*).

³ Dr. Sanday notes this as a characteristic of recent work on the Gospels. See his *Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 41.

conflict, it is unsuitable to the speaker or the context, if otherwise unchallengeable, it is late and unreliable tradition. Wellhausen's *Introduction to the First Three Gospels* is an illustration of how nearly everything which has hitherto been of interest and value in the Gospels—Sermon on the Mount and parables included—disappears under this kind of treatment.¹ Schmiedel's article on the "Gospels" in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* is a yet more extreme example. The application of the method to our immediate subject is admirably seen in Professor Lake's recent book on *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*. A painfully minute and unsparing verbal criticism of the Gospel narratives and of the references in Paul results naturally in the conclusion that there is *no* evidence of any value—except, perhaps, for the general fact of "appearances" to the disciples. No fibre of the history is left standing as it was. Material assistance is afforded to this type of criticism by the theory of the relations of the Gospels which is at present the prevailing one—what Mr. Allen believes to be "the one solid result of literary criticism,"² viz., the dependence of the first and third Gospels, in their narrative portions, on the "prior," Gospel of St. Mark. It is temptingly easy, on this theory, to regard everything in these other Gospels which is not found in, or varies from, St. Mark, as a wilful "writing up" or embellishment of the original simpler story; as something, therefore, to be at once set aside as unhistorical.³

These which have been named are dogmatic and literary assaults; but now, from yet another side, a formidable

¹ See his *Einleitung*, pp. 52–57, 68–72, 86–87, 90–93, etc.

² *St. Matthew*, Pref. p. vii. It is not to be assumed that this judgment, on which more will be said after, is acquiesced in by every one.

³ This is pretty much Wellhausen's method, except that Wellhausen attaches little or no historical value even to St. Mark. Prof. Lake follows in the same track.

attack is seen developing on the historicity of the narratives of the Resurrection—namely, from the side of *comparative religion and mythology*. It is in itself nothing new to draw comparisons between the Resurrection of Jesus, and the stories of death and resurrection in pagan religions. Celsus of old made a beginning in this direction.¹ The myths, too, on which reliance is placed in these comparisons are, in many cases, really there,² and frequently collections have been made of them for the purpose of discrediting the Christian belief. The subject may now be said to have entered on its scientific phase in the study of comparative mythology—for instance, in such a work as Dr. J. G. Frazer's *Golden Bough*³—and as the result of the long train of discoveries throwing light on the religious beliefs and mythological conceptions of the most ancient peoples—Babylonian, Egyptian, Arabian, Persian, and others. In its newest form—sometimes called the “Pan-Babylonian,” though there is yet great diversity of standpoint, and no little division of opinion, among the writers to whom the name is applied—the movement has already attained to imposing proportions, and has given birth to an important literature. Among its best known representatives on the Continent, of different types, are H. Winckler, A. Jeremias, H. Gunkel, P. Jensen; Dr. Cheyne may speak for it here. A chief characteristic of the school is that, declining to look at any people or religion in isolation from general history, it aims at explaining any given religion from the circumstances of its environment, and from analogies and parallels drawn from other religions. Conceptions derived ultimately from Babylonia were

¹ Origen, *Against Celsus*, ii. 55–58.

² Myths of death and resurrection are prominent in the ancient Mysteries. This phase of the subject will be discussed after.

³ Cf. also L. R. Farnell's book, *The Evolution of Religion*.

spread through the whole East, and these, entering through many channels, had a powerful influence in moulding, first the Israelitish, then the Christian religions. Winckler boldly applied his theory to the religious ideas and history of the Old Testament; Gunkel and the others named¹ extend it to the New. "Conservative theologians," writes Dr. Cheyne, "will have to admit that the New Testament now has to be studied from the point of view of mythology as well as from that of philological exegesis and Church-history. . . . For that harmonious combination of points of view which is necessary for the due comprehension of the New Testament, it is essential that the help of mythology, treated of course by strictly critical methods, should be invoked. In short, there are parts of the New Testament—in the Gospels, in the Epistles, and in the Apocalypse—which can only be accounted for by the newly-discovered fact of Oriental syncretism, which began early and continued late. And the leading factor in this is Babylonian."²

The story of the Resurrection is naturally one of the "legends" on the rise of which the new Babylonian theory is supposed to be able to cast special light, and Dr. Cheyne gratefully accepts its help.³ Professor Lake regards it as a theory which, while not proved, "one has seriously to reckon with."⁴ Even Dr. Cheyne, however, is outdone, and is stirred to active protest, by the astonishing lengths to which the theory is carried by Professor Jensen in his recent massive work, *The Gilgamesh Epic in World Literature*,⁵ which literally transforms the Gospel history into a version of the story of that mythical Babylonian hero! It is the saving fact

¹ Cf. Gunkel's *Zum Religionsgeschichtlichen Verständniss des neuen Testaments*. Jeremiah is an exception to the general position in so far that, while accepting the analogies, he does not deny the New Testament facts. See his *Babylonisches im N.T.* ² *Bible Problems*, pp. 18, 19.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 21, 115 ff.

⁴ *Ut supra*, p. 263.

⁵ *Das Gilgamesch-Epos in der Weltliteratur*, Bd. I.

in theories of this kind that they speedily run themselves into excesses which deprive them of influence to right thinking minds.¹

Yet another point of view is reached (though it may be combined with the preceding), when the attempt is made to show that *the idea and spiritual virtue* of Christ's Resurrection can be conserved, while the belief in a bodily rising from the tomb is surrendered. This is the tendency which manifests itself especially in a section of the school of theologians denominated Ritschlian. It connects itself naturally with the disposition in this school to seek the ground of faith in an immediate religious impression—in something verifiable on its own account—and to dissociate faith from doubtful questions of criticism and uncertainties of historical inquiry. Ritschl himself left his relation to the historical fact of the Resurrection in great obscurity. Of those usually reckoned as his followers, some accept and defend the fact,² but the greater number sit loose to the idea of a bodily Resurrection, claiming that it cannot be established by historical evidence, and in any case is not an essential element of faith.³ Most *reject* the bodily rising as inconsistent with an order of nature. The certainty to which the Christian holds fast is that Christ, his Lord, still lives and rules, but this is, as Herrmann would say, a "thought of faith"—a conviction of Christ's abiding life, based on the estimate of His religious worth, and not affected by any view that may be held as to His physical resuscitation. There can be no doubt that the feeling which this line of argument represents is very widely spread.

The name which most readily occurs in connexion with the

¹ The general theory will be discussed in a future paper.

² E.g., Kaftan, Loofs, Häring.

³ Among those who take this position may be named Herrmann, J. Weiss, Wendt, Lobstein, Reischle, etc. Some of these admit supernatural impressions." (See below.)

view of the Resurrection now indicated is that of Professor Harnack, whose Berlin lectures, translated under the title, *What is Christianity?* ¹ have helped not a little to popularize it. Harnack had earlier unambiguously stated his position in his *History of Dogma*. "Faith," it is there contended, "has by no means to do with the knowledge of the form in which Jesus lives, but only with the conviction that He is the living Lord." "We do not need to have faith in a fact, and that which requires religious belief, that is, trust in God, can never be a fact which would hold good apart from that belief. The historical question and the question of faith must, therefore, be clearly distinguished here." He seeks to show the weakness of the historical evidence—"even the empty grave on the third day can by no means be regarded as a certain historical fact"—and declares: "(1) That every conception which represents the Resurrection of Christ as a simple reanimation of His mortal body [no one affirms that it is] is far from the original conception, and (2) that the question generally as to whether Christ has risen can have no evidence for any one who looks at it apart from the contents and worth of the Person of Jesus." ² Quite to the same effect, if in warmer language, Harnack distinguishes in his Berlin lectures between what he calls "the Easter message" and "the Easter faith"—the former telling us of "that wonderful event in Joseph of Arimathæa's garden, which, however, no eye saw"; the latter being "the conviction that the Crucified One still lives; that God is just and powerful; that He who is the firstborn among many brethren still lives." The former, the historical foundation, faith "must abandon altogether, and with it the miraculous appeal to our senses." Nevertheless, "Whatever may have happened at the grave and in the manner of the appearances, one thing is certain:

¹ *Das Wesen des Christentums*.

² Eng. trans. i. pp. 85-86.

this grave was the birthplace of the indestructible belief that death is vanquished, that there is a life eternal.”¹ The logic is not very easy to follow, but this is not the place to criticise it. Enough if it is made clear how this mode of conceiving of the Resurrection of Christ, which imports a new element into the discussion, presents itself to the minds that hold it.

The “appearances” to the disciples, however, still are there, variously and well attested, as by Paul’s famous list in 1 Corinthians xv. 4–8, as to which even Strauss says : “There is no occasion to doubt that the Apostle Paul heard this from Peter, James, and perhaps from others concerned (cf. Gal. i. 18 ff., ii. 9), and that all of these, even the five hundred, were firmly convinced that they had seen Jesus who had been dead and was alive again.”² What is the explanation? Were they simply, as Strauss thought, visions, hallucinations, delusions? Here is a new dividing-line, even among those who reject the reality of the Lord’s bodily Resurrection. The appearances were too real and persistent, they feel, to be explained as the mere work of the imagination. Phantasy has its laws, and it does not operate in this strange way. There were appearances, but may they not have been *appearances of the spiritually risen* Christ, manifestations from the life beyond the grave by one whose body was still sleeping in the tomb? So thought Keim, who argued powerfully against the subjective visionary theory³—so thinks even Professor Lake.⁴

The idea is not wholly a new one,⁵ but Keim brought new support to it in his *Jesus of Nazara*, and since then it has commended itself to many minds, who have found in

¹ *What is Christianity?* E.T., 1900, pp. 161–2.

² *New Life of Jesus*, i. p. 400.

³ *Jesus of Nazara* (E.T.), vi. pp. 323 ff.

⁴ *Ut supra*, pp. 271–6.

⁵ It appears in Schenkel, Weiss, Schweitzer, and others.

it a *via media* between complete denial of the Resurrection and acceptance of the physical miracle of the bodily rising. It has obtained the adhesion of not a few of the members of the Ritschlian school.¹

All this belongs to the older stage of the controversy. It perhaps would not have sufficed to bring about a revival of the theory but for the new turn given to speculation on appearances of the dead by the investigations and reports of the Society of Psychical Research. It is to "the type of phenomena collected" by this Society, "and specially by the late Mr. F. W. H. Myers," that Professor Lake attaches himself in his hypothetical explanation.² His position, as stated by himself, is a curious inversion of the older one. Formerly, the Resurrection of Jesus was thought to be a guarantee of the future life—of immortality. Now, it appears, the future life "remains merely a hypothesis until it can be shown that personal life does endure beyond death, is neither extinguished nor suspended, and is capable of manifesting its existence to us."³ Professor Lake has not the sanguineness of Professor Harnack. He thinks that "some evidence" has been produced by men of high scientific standing connected with the above Society, but "we must wait until the experts have sufficiently sifted the arguments for alternative explanations of the phenomena before they can actually be used as reliable evidence for the survival of personality after death."⁴ The belief in the Resurrection of Christ even in the *spiritual* sense—that is, as survival of personality—depends on the success of these same experiments of the Psychical Research Society.

This theory, it will naturally occur, is not a theory of

¹ Among these Bornemann, Reischle, and others, leave the question open: J. Weiss argues for supernatural impressions, etc.

² *Uti supra*, p. 272.

³ *Ibid.* p. 245.

⁴ *Ibid.*

“Resurrection,” in the New Testament sense of that word, at all ; but we have to do here with the fact that some people believe that it is, or, at least, that it represents the reality which lies behind the narratives of Resurrection in the Gospels. Mr. Myers himself identifies the two things, and, as illustrating this phase of speculation, which has assumed, in an age of unbelief in the supernatural, a semi-scientific aspect, it may be useful in closing, to quote his own words :—

“I venture now,” he says, “on a bold saying : for I predict that, in consequence of the new evidence, all reasonable men, a century hence, will believe the Resurrection of Christ, whereas, in default of the new evidence, no reasonable men, a century hence, would have believed it. The ground of the forecast is plain enough. Our ever-growing recognition of the continuity, the uniformity of cosmic law has gradually made of the alleged uniqueness of any incident its almost inevitable refutation. . . . And especially as to that central claim, of the soul’s life manifested after the body’s death, it is plain that this can less and less be supported by remote tradition alone ; that it must more and more be tested by modern experience and inquiry. . . . Had the results (in short) of ‘psychical research’ been purely negative, would not Christian evidence—I do not say Christian *emotion*, but Christian *evidence*—have received an overwhelming blow ?

“As a matter of fact—or, if you prefer the phrase, in my own personal opinion—our research has led us to results of a quite different type. They have not been negative only, but largely positive. We have shown that, amid much deception and self-deception, fraud and illusion, veritable manifestations do reach us from beyond the grave. The central claim of Christianity is thus confirmed, as never before. . . . There is nothing to hinder

the conviction that, though we be all 'the children of the Highest,' He came nearer than we, by some space by us immeasurable, to that which is infinitely far. There is nothing to hinder the devout conviction that He of His own act 'took upon Him the form of a servant,' and was made flesh for our salvation, foreseeing the earthly travail and the eternal crown." ¹

JAMES ORR.

LEXICAL NOTES FROM THE PAPYRI.

IV.

A WORD of preface is necessary in returning to these Notes after an interval of nearly four years. Arrangements had been made for the publication in book form of the lexical matter contained in the three previous articles, together with further material collected subsequently. To this task I addressed myself when the completion of my *Prolegomena* gave me breathing space ; but I soon realized that a mere casual supplementing of the original papers—themselves made up of mere pickings by the way—would not be worth attempting. Something like a systematic search of the papyri, and to a less extent the later inscriptions, seemed necessary, that the New Testament student might have before him a tolerably complete exhibition of the use of New Testament words in the Hellenistic vernacular. He has already in Wetstein and later commentators, and in such a dictionary as Thayer's Grimm, a fairly exhaustive account of the literary use of every word. What he needs now is a similar apparatus for the Greek of common life, as revealed in the mass of vernacular documents which are becoming accessible in increasing numbers to-day. To make a beginning in this work is the object

¹ *Human Personality and its Survival*, ii. pp. 288-9.

I set before me. I had not, however, finished a first draft of words in *a* before I saw that the task was beyond my unaided capacity, especially as my time was primarily mortgaged to the completion of my grammar. I sought a colleague, and I now write these lines over my own signature that I may be free to congratulate myself on my success. My friend Dr. George Milligan had been kind enough to send me the proofs of his forthcoming commentary on *Thessalonians*. As to its all-round excellence in the ordinary and necessary features of a commentary readers will soon be of one mind with me. But what especially took hold of me was the fullness of illustration which Dr. Milligan had supplied from the very sources on which I was working. And when he gave his ready consent to join me in this enterprise, it displeased neither of us to reflect that by a law of primogeniture we had taken up the entail of a partnership between two scholars who sat together in the Jerusalem Chamber at the New Testament Revision, and wrote together a commentary on the Gospel of St. John.

In the papers of which this is the first instalment we propose to present a first draft of our new material, so far as neither of us has printed it before. When we gather it together, we shall incorporate with it for completeness' sake a summary of material collected by others, and in special by our friend Dr. Adolf Deissmann, the pioneer of this branch of New Testament study. We take the opportunity of expressing the hope that scholars who in their own reading have gathered illustrations overlooked by us, will assist us and fellow-members of the craft by kindly sending us notes.

It only remains to be said that for saving of space we have not adopted the standard abbreviations of the titles of papyrus collections, as set forth by Wilcken, but have fallen back on the much shorter forms used in my *Pro-*

legomena. It is perhaps needless to repeat the table of abbreviations here.¹

J. H. M.

ἀβαρής.—*Notes* iii. 424. Nägeli 38. Add BU 1080 (iii/A.D. ?) εἴ σοι ἀβαρές ἐστὶ καὶ δυνα[τόν, σ]υναπόστιλόν μοι κ.τ.λ.

ἀγαθοποιός.—The rare *ἀ*. is found as an astrological term in a magical papyrus of iv/A.D. BM I. 116 ἀγαθοποιέ τ. οἰκουμένης : cf. p. 66.

ἀγαθός.—The compar. *βελτίων* occurs in PP III. 42H (Witk. 13), of iii/B.C. One phrase may be worth quoting :

¹ New abbreviations are the following :—

Str P = Strassburg Papyri, ed. Fr. Preisigke. Band i., Heft 1, 1906.

Lp P = Leipzig Papyri, ed. L. Mitteis. Band i., 1906.

Rein P = Papyri edited by Th. Reinach (Paris, 1905).

Ostr. = A. Wilcken's *Griechische Ostraka*.

BM III. = British Museum Papyri, ed. F. G. Kenyon and H. I. Bell, 1907. (The Museum papyri are cited by pages, the rest by numbers.)

Witk. = *Epistulae Privatae Graecae*, ed. S. Witkowski. Teubner, 1907. (Cited by pages. The reference to Witkowski's edition is regularly given as well as the original designation, since there is often a revised text : the commentary likewise is valuable.)

Syll. = *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, by W. Dittenberger. Second edition (Leipzig, 1898–1901). Cited by numbers. The following are all cited by pages :—

Mayser = *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, by E. Mayser (Leipzig, 1906).

Nägeli = *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus*, by Th. Nägeli (Göttingen, 1905).

Proleg. = *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, by J. H. Moulton. Vol. i., *Prolegomena*. Second edition (Edinburgh, 1906).

Thess. = *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians*, by G. Milligan (Macmillan, 1908). References will sometimes be made by chapter and verse).

Notes i., ii., iii. denote previous papers in this series : see *EXPOSITOR*, vi. iii. 271, vii. 104, viii. 423 respectively.

The dates of papyri are regularly given, except sometimes for the Petrie and Hibeh collections, which are entirely Ptolemaic.

Square brackets denote supplements made by the editors where the document has a gap. We have not reproduced these where the missing letters are few and admit of no possible doubt.

Roman capitals are used in abbreviations for papyri collections, italics for those of inscriptions and ostraca.

For other abbreviations see *Proleg.*² pp. xvii.–xx., 258–262.

P Fi 21 (iii/A.D.) τῇ ἐπ' ἀγαθοῖς γεινομ[ένη κατασπορά i.q. "auspiciously"—so BU 835 (iii/A.D.), BM III. 208 ἐὰν δὲ ἐξέλθῃς ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ (ii/A.D.).

ἀγανακτέω.—BM I. 34 (ii/B.C.) ἀγανακτοῦντα ἐφ' οἷς διετελοῦντο ἐν τοιούτῳ ἱερῷ.

ἀγγαρεύω.—See Mayser 42, 56. Ptolemaic exx. are PP II. 20 τοῦ . . . λέμβου . . . ἀγγαρευθέντος ὑπὸ σοῦ, TbP 5 182. 252 (so Wilcken). From i/A.D. add BM III. 107 (a prefect's rescript) μηδενὶ ἐξέστω ἐνγαρεύειν τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς χώρας.

ἀγγεῖον is found in TP I. p. 2 for the casket or chest in which plaintiffs to the court of the Chrematistae, or Greek judges of Egypt, were in the habit of placing their petitions (*Archiv* iii. 26 ff.).

ἀγέλη.—BM III. 177 (i/B.C.) *bis*.

ἀγενής, as opposed to εὐγενής, is well illustrated by OP 33 (late ii/A.D.) where, in a dramatic interview with the Emperor, in all probability Marcus Aurelius, a certain Appianus, who has been condemned to death, appeals to his nobility (εὐγένεια) in such a way as to lead the Emperor to retort—Φῆς οὖν ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἀγενεῖς ἐσμέν; Cf. also *Syll.* 862²³. For the more general sense of "mean," "base," see the illiterate OP 79 (not earlier than ii/A.D.), perhaps a school composition (G. and H.), μηδὲν ταπινὸν μηδὲ ἀγενὲς . . . πράξης.

ἀγκυρα.—BM III. 164 (iii/A.D.) ἀνκύραις σιδηραῖς δυσὶ σὺν σπάθαις σιδηραῖς (the two teeth of the anchor).

ἀγνεία.—In BU 149 (ii/iii A.D.) we have some temple accounts including καὶ ταῖς κωμασίαις τῶν θεῶν (processions of images of the gods) τοῖς ἀγνεύουσι ἐκ περιτροπῆς (according to rota) ἱερεῦσι θώθ $\bar{\alpha}$ ὑπὲρ ἀγνείας ἡμερῶν ξ ἐξ ἡμερησιῶν [so much]. A very similar entry, but without date, appears in BU 1 (iii/A.D.). Dr. J. G. Frazer tells us that the ἀγνεία most probably refers to certain ceremonial abstin-

ences (taboos) observed by the priests on New Year's Day (see his *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*, 229=ed.² 288). Par P 5 (ii/B.C.) couples ἀγνειῶν and λειτουργιῶν following τάφων. Cf. *Syll.* 655 μετὰ πολλῆς ἀγνείας καὶ νομίμων ἐθῶν, and the striking inscription from Epidaurus, *ap.* Porphyg. *de abst.* II. 19 ἀγνὸν χρὴ ναοῖο θυώδεος ἐντὸς ἰόντα ἔμμεναι ἀγνεία δ' ἐστὶ φρονεῖν ὅσια (cited by Dittenberger on *Syll.* 567). Add TbP 298⁶⁸⁻⁷⁰ (ii/A.D.); and see below under ἀγνός.

ἀγνοέω.—PP III. 53r, [οὐκ οἶ]μαι σὲ ἀγνοεῖν, is a good parallel to the Pauline οὐ θέλομεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν (1 Thess. iv. 13). The verb occurs again in the same collection of fragments (53n) where a certain Petous is described as ὃν οὐδὲ σὺ ἀγνοεῖς εὐχρηστον ὄντα τοῖς ἐν τῷ νομῷ. In G 43⁶, (ii/B.C.) Wilcken reads ἀγνοοῦμ(εν) for Grenfell's Δανοοῦλο[s]. Add BU 140, P-Alex 3 (Witk. 32), etc.

ἀγνόημα.—In the proclamation of Euergetes II., TbP 5³ (118 B.C.), the king and queen [ἀ]φιᾶσει τοὺς ὑ[πὸ] τῇ[ν βασιλῆαν π]άντας ἀγνοημάτων ἀμαρτημ[άτ]ων ἐν[κλημάτων καταγνωσμάτων] αἰτιῶν πασῶν up to a certain date, murder and sacrilege excepted. So *ib.* 124²⁴. Similarly in Par P 63 (ii/B.C.) one of the Ptolemies writes ἀπολελυκότες πάντας τοὺς ἐνεσχημένους ἐν τισιν ἀγνοήμασιν ἢ ἀμαρτήμασιν ἕως τῆς ιθ τοῦ Ἐπεῖφ. (On ἐνέχεσθαι ἐν see *Proleg.* 61 f.). The Seleucid Demetrius uses a like combination in 1 Macc. xiii. 39; and it is further found in Tob. iii. 3, and Sir. xxiii. 2 (cited by Thayer). Ἀγνόημα is accordingly marked by this association as meaning an offence of some kind, and "error" is its natural equivalent; so in Heb. ix. 7.

ἄγνοια.—The connotation of wilful blindness, as in Eph. iv. 18, is found in TbP 24 (ii/B.C.) where an official reports the misconduct of certain persons whose plans he had frustrated, so that λήγοντες τῆς ἀγνοίας they left the district. The writer had ἀνοίας first, and then added γ above the line.

ἀγνός.—It may be noted that this word and its adverb are constantly used in a sense much like that of our *honest*, of administration, etc. (cf. Pind. *Ol.* 3, 37). Thus *OGIS* 485 (Magnesia, Roman age) τὰς λοιπὰς δὲ φιλοτειμίας τελιάσαντα (sic) ἀγνῶς καὶ ἀμέμπτως, *ibid.* 524 (Thyatira, do.) ἀγορανομήσαντα τετράμηνον ἀγνῶς, *ibid.* 560 (Lycia, i/A.D.) τῷ [εὐεργέ]τῃ καὶ κτίστῃ καὶ [δικαιο]δότῃ ἀγνῶ. The word is as wide therefore as our *pure*, when used ethically, and must not be narrowed unless the context is clear. It may, however, be noticed that in pagan technical language the word definitely connoted twofold abstinence, as a necessary condition of entrance into a temple. The definition of Hesychius gives us the condition in its oldest form: “ἀγνεύειν· καθαρεύειν ἀπὸ τε ἀφροδισίων καὶ ἀπὸ νεκροῦ.” In later times a distinction was made between lawful and illicit intercourse: its beginnings may be seen in the Pergamene inscription *Syll.* 566 (ii/B.C.)—Ἀγνεύετῶσαν δὲ καὶ εἰσίστῶσαν εἰς τὸν τῆς θεο[ῦ] ναόν] . . . πάντες ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ἰδίας [γυναι]κὸς καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀνδρὸς αὐθημερόν, ἀπὸ δὲ ἀλλοτρίας καὶ ἀλλοτρίου δευτεραῖοι λουσάμενοι· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ κήδους καὶ τεκούσης γυναικὸς δευτεραῖος· ἀπὸ δὲ τάφου καὶ ἐκφορ[ᾶς] περιρασάμενοι (i.e. -ραν-) καὶ διελθόντες τὴν πύλην καθ’ ἣν τὰ ἀγιστήρια τίθεται, καθαροὶ αὐθημερόν. See further Dittenberger *in loc.* Since the word originally meant “in a condition prepared for worship”—cf. Zend *yasna*, “ritual,” Sanskrit *yaj*, Zend *yaz*, “to worship”—this technical meaning is the oldest.

ἀγοράζω.—Very common in deeds of sale, e.g. BM III. 14, 19. Both the verb and the corresponding subst. are found in OP 298, a long letter by a tax-collector of i/A.D., στατήρας πορφύ[ρ]ας ἀγόρασον . . . ἐὰν εὖρης ἀγ[ο]ραστὴν τοῦ μέρ[ους] τῆς οἰκίας.

ἀγοραῖος.—In *OGIS* 484⁰⁰ (ii/A.D.), an imperial rescript addressed to the Pergamenes, we find ταῖς ἀγοραίοις

πιπρασκομένων, unfortunately before and after gaps, but the gender shows that *ἡμέραι* is understood, "market-days." The same ellipsis occurs in Acts xix. 38, but with the other meaning of *ἀγορά* implied. In *Syll.* 553⁴³ the word is used of "merchants," "dealers" (ii/B.C.).

ἀγράμματος is of constant occurrence in the formula used by one person signing a deed or letter on behalf of another who cannot write—*ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ τινος ἀγραμμάτου*, e.g. BU 118 and 152 (both ii/A.D.).

ἀγριέλαιος.—In view of Sir W. M. Ramsay's recent discussion of the meaning of *ἀγριέλαιος* in Rom. xi. 7 (see *Paul. Stud.* 219 ff.) the occurrence of the adjective in *Syll.* 540¹⁸⁹ may be noted—*κύβους κατασκευ[ασάμεν]ος ξυλῶν ξηρῶν ἀγριελαινῶν* (ii/B.C.).

ἄγριος is used of a "malignant" wound or sore in *Syll.* 802¹¹⁴ (iii/B.C.); 806⁵ (Roman age):

ἀγρυπνία.—The rare *ἀγρυπνία*, in New Testament only 2 Cor. vi. 5, xi. 27, is found in *Syll.* 803⁵⁰ (iii/B.C.), *οὗτος ἀγρυπνίαις συνεχόμενος διὰ τὸν πόνον τᾶς κεφαλᾶς*—a passage which also throws light on the New Testament usage of *συνέχομαι*, e.g. Matt. iv. 24 *νόσοις κ. βασάνοις συνεχόμενους*.

ἄγω.—For *ἄγω* in the sense of "fetch," "carry away," see OP 742 (2 B.C.), where instructions are given to deposit certain bundles of reeds in a safe place *ἵνα τῇ ἀναβάσει αὐτὰς ἄξωμεν*. For the construction with *μετά* (2 Tim. iv. 11) cf. PP II. 32 *ἄγων μεθ' αὐτοῦ*. There is also the meaning "lead," of a road or canal, as PP I. 22.

ἀγωγή.—The meaning *conduct* may be paralleled from TbP 24 (ii/B.C.) *μοχθηρὰν ἀγωγήν*, and OGIS 223 (a Seleucid rescript, iii/B.C.) *φαίνεσθε γὰρ καθόλου ἀγωγή ταύτη χρῆσθαι*. Dittenberger in his note on No. 474 (i/A.D.) collects other examples. *Ἀγωγήν ποιεῖσθαι* in the sense of "carry off," "arrest" is found in TbP 39, 48 (both ii/B.C.). Cf. also its sense of "load," "freight," in the Ostraca,

e.g. 707 (Ptol.) ἕνα ἀγω(γὴν), 1168 εἰς τὰς καμείνους ἀγωγαί (sc. ἀχύρου). So BM III. 164 and 165 (iii/A.D.). A legal term in BM III. 221 (iii/A.D.).

ἀγών figuratively in P Fi 36 (iv/A.D.) τὸν περὶ ψυχῆς ἀγῶνα. For the literal meaning see *Syll.* 524 where various τῶν τε παίδων καὶ τῶν ἐφήβων . . . ἀγῶνες in reading, music, etc., are enumerated.

ἀγωνία.—So TbP 423 (early iii/A.D.) ὥς εἰς ἀγωνίαν με γενέσθαι ἐν τῷ παρόντι. The corresponding verb is common, with the meaning “to be distressed, to fear.” Thus PP II. 11 γράφε δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ σὺ ἵνα εἰδῶμεν ἐν οἷς εἰ καὶ μὴ ἀγωνιῶμεν (Witk. 7—iii/B.C.). *Ibid.* III. 53 οὐ γὰρ ὥς ἔτυχεν ἀγωνιῶμεν. OP 744 (i/B.C.) μὴ ἀγωνιᾶς ἐὰν ὅλως εἰσπορεύονται, “do not worry,” and again ἐρωτῶ σε οὖν ἵνα μὴ ἀγωνιάσης (Witk. 97 f.). Par P 49 and 44 (both ii/B.C.—Witk. pp. 47 and 59).

ἀγωνίζομαι is very common in the inscriptions, e.g. *Syll.* 213²³, ἀγωνιζόμενος ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας (iii/B.C.), and 180 (end of iv/B.C.), of an envoy's efforts to secure a peace. Cf. *ibid.* 163, 198, 199, 214 *al.*

ἀδελφός—For ἀδελφός to denote a member of the same religious community even in pagan circles, see the references given by Milligan on 1 Thess. i. 4: here we note only one or two examples of the wider usages of the word. In BM I. 30 Ἰσιὰς Ἡφαιστίωνι τῷ ἀδελφῷ χαί(ρειν), it seems probable that Isias is addressing her *husband*, not *brother*: see Kenyon's note *ad l.* where Letronne's statement that the Ptolemies called their wives ἀδελφαί even when they were not actually so is quoted. Witkowski (pp. 37 f.) maintains this against Wilcken, quoting Wilamowitz (*Gr. Lesebuch*, I. 397), and noting that Isias says ἡ μήτηρ σου. He remarks that the word seems to have been usual to describe those who were attached in a certain way to the community at the Serapeum. Cf. also Witk. pp. 60 and 66 (Par P 45

and 48, ii/B.C.), where men address with τῷ ἀδελφῷ χαίρειν men who are no relation to them. Of course in Egypt the word very often described a double relation of sister and wife—e.g. TbP 320 (ii/A.D.) τῆς . . . γυναικὸς . . . [οὔσης μο]υ ὁμοπ(ατρίου) καὶ ὁμ[ομ(ητρίου) ἀδ]ελ(φῆς). So OP 744 (1 B.C.) Ἰλαρίων Ἄλιτι τῇ ἀδελφῇ πλεῖστα χαίρειν, the “sister” being no doubt Ilarion’s “wife” (G. and H.). For the evidence of the inscriptions see *Syll.* 474¹⁰ ἀδελφοὶ οἷς κοινὰ τὰ πατρῶα, 276²⁸ διὰ τὸ Μεσσαλιήτας εἶναι ἡμῖν ἀδελφούς. Ἀδελφός, as a title of address, is discussed in *Rhein. Mus.* N.F. LV. 170.

ἄδηλος.—OP 118 (late iii/A.D.), διὰ τὸ ἄδηλον τῆς ὁδοιπορίας. BM III. 118 (iii/A.D.) ἀδήλου ὄντος εἰ ὑμῖν διαφέρει ἡ κληρονομία.

ἀδημονέω.—OP 298 (i/A.D.) λῖαν ἀδημονοῦμεν χάριν τῆς θρεπτῆς Σαραπούτος is translated by the edd. “I am excessively concerned.” On the etymology of this word Mr. F. W. Allen has a suggestion in *CR* xx. 5.

ἀδιαλείπτως.—TbP 27 (ii/B.C.) is an early example of this Hellenistic compound—τὴν ἀδιαλίπτως προσφερομένην σπουδὴν: cf. BU 180 (ii/iii A.D.) ἐν λειτουργίᾳ εἰμὶ ἀδιαλείπτως, *Syll.* 732¹⁵ (i/B.C.) ἀδιαλείπτως δὲ ἐπαγωνίζομενος. 805 (Roman period) of a cough. Other citations are needless.

ἀδιάφθορος.—In *Syll.* 168²⁵ (iv/B.C.) the Athenian statesman Lycurgus is praised as ἀδιάφθορον κ. [ἀνεξέλεγκτον αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ] τ. πατρίδος . . . παρ[έχων]. Some late MSS. give the derived noun (-ία) in Titus ii. 7, and Grimm ingenuously traces our adjective to the verb “ἀδιαφθείρω”!!

ἄδικος.—TbP 286 (ii/A.D.) νομὴ ἄδικος οὐδὲν εἰσχύει, “unjust possession is invalid.” For the verb of the Passalacqua papyrus (Witk. 34—Ptolemaic) φρόντισον οὖν ὅπως μὴ ἀδικηθῇ ὁ ἄνθρωπος. Of land being “injured,” in *Syll.* 557.

ἄδολος.—Scores of examples of ἄδ. in the sense of “pure,” “unadulterated” can be produced. Thus Hb P 85 (261 B.C.)

σίτον καθαρὸν ἄδολον ἀπὸ πάντων, *ibid.* 98 (251 B.C.) σίτον κα[θαρὸν ἄ]δ[ο]λον κεκοσκιν[ευμένον] ("sifted"). Six examples come from this volume of iii/B.C. papyri, all referring to "unadulterated" corn. OP 729 (137 A.D.) ἀπ]οδότῳσαν τῷ μεμισθωκότι τὸν μὲν οἶνον παρὰ λήνδον νέον ἄδολον gives the rare application to liquids (as P Fi 65 vi/A.D.): it is applied to λάχανον in BU 1015 (iii/A.D.). Cf. *Syll.* 653, 100 οἱ πωλοῦντες ἄδολα καὶ καθάρᾳ. So of χρῖμα in Aeschylus *Ag.* 95 (but cf. Verrall), and in modern Greek of wine (Abbott, *Songs of Modern Greece*, p. 68).

ἀδρότης.—In *Ostr.* 1600 (ii/A.D.) ἀδρo_κ appears twice, representing presumably something from ἀδρός.

ἀδυνατέω.—For the sense "to be incapable" cf. Par P 35 (ii/B.C.), 63 (*ibid.*) τοὺς ἀδυνατοῦντας ἀναγκάζειν ἐπιδέχεσθαι τὰ τῆς γεωργίας. The adjective is used in Par P 66 (late Ptol.) πρεσβύτεροι καὶ ἀδύνατοι of men not strong enough to work: cf. also BM III. 128 (iii/iv A.D.) ἀδύνατος γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ γυνή διὰ ἀσθένειαν τῆς φύσεως. In *Syll.* 802³⁵ (iii/B.C.) ἀδύνατος is associated with ἀπίθανος, applied to ἰάματα: *ibid.* 512 of a witness who cannot appear.

ἀηδία.—This vernacular word (Luke xxiii. 12 D) is supported by Par P 48 (Witk. 67—ii/B.C.) τοῦ πρὸς σὲ τὴν ἀηδείαν ποήσαντος, "who had that disagreement with you," BM II. 174 (ii/A.D.) ἄλογον ἀηδίαν συνεστήσαντο, and almost identically in BU 22 (early ii/A.D.); cf. TbP 304 (ii/A.D.) ἀητίαν [i.e.-δίαν] συνῆψαν, "they picked a quarrel." The verb ἀηδίζομαι occurs in BM I. 30 (Witk. 39—ii/B.C.), meaning "aegre fero."

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

(To be continued.)

**THE PHILOLOGY OF THE GREEK BIBLE :
ITS PRESENT AND FUTURE.¹**

IV.

NEW TESTAMENT PHILOLOGY.

We concluded our third lecture with a short mention of the beginnings that are just being made in the exegesis of the Greek Old Testament. The exegesis of the Greek *New Testament* can look back upon a history of many centuries. The fact, however, that the New Testament as distinguished from the Greek Old Testament possesses an international exegetical literature of its own which promises soon to attain unmanageable dimensions, is not necessarily a proof of a revival of interest in its philological investigation. The more recent commentaries, indeed, leave much to be desired from the philological point of view.

How greatly the exegesis of the New Testament is able to profit by the progress of classical archaeology in the widest sense is shown by the writings of Sir William Ramsay,² the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans by Hans Lietzmann,³ the Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Matthew by Th. Zahn⁴ and by W. C. Allen,⁵ and the Commentary on the Epistles to the Thessalonians about to be published by George Milligan.

¹ These lectures were delivered in the Summer School of the Free Churches, at Cambridge, in July and August, 1907. In writing them I allowed myself the use of part of an address given by me at Giessen in 1897. The lectures were translated for me by Mr. Lionel R. M. Strachan, M.A., Lector of English in the University of Heidelberg.

² See above.

³ Hans Lietzmann, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, vol. iii., pp. 1-80, Tübingen, 1906.

⁴ Theodor Zahn, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, vol. i., Leipzig, 1903; zweite Auflage, 1905.

⁵ W. C. Allen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Matthew*. Edinburgh, 1907. (The International Critical Commentary.)

Any further discussion of the enormous output of Commentaries in the last few years is beyond our present scope. Nor is this the occasion to review the work accomplished in New Testament textual criticism, important as it is to the New Testament philologist and tempting as it would be to speak of it here in Cambridge, where great traditions in textual criticism have been inherited and made greater by men and women of distinguished learning.

We may, however, mention in the first place as a book of great value to the New Testament philologist the Concordance to the New Testament by W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden.¹ A revised edition of an older work, the excellent Concordance of Bruder,² is also being prepared by Schmiedel.

But the most remarkable fact that strikes us on reviewing recent work is that, after a long period of stagnation in the grammatical department, we have had in the last twelve years three new Grammars of the New Testament, by Paul Wilhelm Schmiedel, Friedrich Blass, and James Hope Moulton, and that the publication of a fourth, by Ludwig Radermacher, is impending.

Schmiedel's book claims only to be a revised edition (the eighth) of G. B. Winer's Grammar.³ The old Winer, when first published was a protest of the philological conscience against the caprices of an arrogant empiricism. For half a century it exercised a decisive influence on exegetical work—which is a long time for any Grammar, and for a Greek Grammar in the nineteenth century a very long time indeed.

¹ *A Concordance to the Greek Testament according to the text of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and the English Revisers.* Edited by Rev. W. F. Moulton and Rev. A. S. Geden. Edinburgh, 1897.

² Ταμειον των της Καινης Διαθηκης λεξεων sive Concordantiae omnium vocum Novi Testamenti Graeci, primum ab Erasmo Schmidio editae, nunc secundum critices et hermeneutices nostrae aetatis rationes emendatae, auctae, meliori ordine dispositae cura C. H. Bruder, Lipsiae, 1842; editio stereotypa quarta, Lipsiae, 1888, sexta 1904.

³ See above.

While most warmly appreciating its merits we may yet say, without prejudice to the truth, that it has had its day. If you use the old edition of Winer now—and it is still to some extent indispensable—it is possible to find yourself thinking that what was once its strength constitutes also the weakness of the book. And I believe the feeling is not without foundation. Often you feel that something is represented as regular where there is no such thing as regularity, or uniform where the characteristic individuality of the single fact calls for recognition. In short you receive too much the impression of a “New Testament idiom” as a sharply defined magnitude in the history of the Greek language.

If in speaking of Schmiedel's new Winer I may be allowed to begin with an objection, it is a fault, so it seems to me, that there is still too much Winer and too little Schmiedel in the book. This applies, however, only to the introductory paragraphs, where Schmiedel has allowed much to remain that is afterwards tacitly contradicted by his own statements. On the whole the new edition—or new book, as it is really—marks a characteristic and decisive turning point in New Testament philology. The phenomena of the language of the New Testament are exhibited conscientiously, and as a rule adequately, in relation with the history of the Greek language. The sources accessible to Schmiedel, especially the inscriptions and papyri, are made exhaustive use of. Unfortunately the majority of the papyrus discoveries did not come until after the appearance of Schmiedel's *Accidence* in 1894. Such preliminary studies as existed for the philologist were used by Schmiedel, and, sad to say, there were not many. All the more must we admire the industry, the faithfulness in detail, and the eye for the great connexions traceable in the history of language, to which the book bears witness. Schmiedel's minute accuracy is well known. It does one's heart good in this false world to meet with such trustworthy quotations.

It is a pity that Schmiedel has not yet been able to complete the work ; but as a splendid Greek scholar, Eduard Schwyzer, of Zürich, the grammarian of the Pergamos inscriptions, has been recently engaged as a collaborator, it may be hoped that " Winer and Schmiedel " will not have to remain a torso much longer.

In his review ¹ of Schmiedel's *Accidence* Friedrich Blass was not so warm as he might have been in acknowledging the merits of the work. In his own *Grammar*,² however, he openly acknowledges that he owed very much to Schmiedel.

And, indeed, without Schmiedel's book Blass's *Grammar* would not have been possible. In the review mentioned Blass observed that the gulf between theology and philology was noticeable here and there in Schmiedel, and by saying so invited the use of the same standard on his own *Grammar*. Now in my opinion the separation between theology and philology is altogether without justification in this field of research, and the controversy that occasionally flares up is most regrettable. But as things are at present, the professed Greek scholar who takes up the study of the Bible has generally the advantage of a larger knowledge of the non-Biblical sources of the language, while the theologian is better acquainted with the Biblical texts and their exegetical problems. Prejudiced though it may sound to say so, my impression on comparing the two *Grammars* was that Schmiedel's defects in philology were slighter than those of Blass in theology. To speak in the language of mankind that knows no Faculties, as regards the positive interpretation of the texts of the New Testament Schmiedel is the more stimulating, so far as can be judged from the first instalment of his *Syntax*.

¹ *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1894, xix. col. 532-534.

² See above. Translated into English by H. St. J. Thackeray, London, 1898 ; 2nd ed., 1905.

A Grammar must not be wanting in cheerful willingness to leave some things undecided. It must be seriously recognized and admitted that there are such things as open questions. That Blass theoretically held this view is shown by the following chance remark in his Grammar.¹ "The kind of relation subsisting between the genitive and its noun can only be recognized from the sense and context; and in the New Testament this is often solely a matter of theological interpretation, which cannot be taught in a Grammar." But this principle, so extremely important methodologically, is not always followed. In passages where it is certain that the phraseology is peculiar, and where the exegetical possibilities are equal, Blass often comes and smooths away with his grammatical plane something that seems like an irregularity but is really not so.

Beginners in exegesis are apt to content themselves with what they find by help of the index of texts in Blass. That is certainly not at all what Blass intended, but it is probably the consequence of what must be complained of as the theological deficiency of the book. A Grammar, especially when it bears the name of a famous philologist, is easily regarded by the average person who uses it as a compendium of all that is reducible to fixed laws and therefore as absolutely dependable. If Blass could have brought himself to rouse up energetically this easy-going deference of the youthful reader, as he might have done in many parts of the Syntax, his book would have gained decidedly in value as a book for students.

I count it as one of the excellencies of the book that in the introduction the author adopts a definitive attitude on the question of "New Testament" Greek. In spite of the title, and in spite of some occasional relapses (which must not be regarded too seriously) to the method formerly cham-

¹ *Zweite Auflage*, p. 97, § 35, 1.

pioned by Blass, it is made plain that there is no such thing as a special "New Testament" Greek, and that therefore the claim of the New Testament to have a special grammar of its own can only be based on the practical needs of Bible study. As was only to be expected from Blass, the book contains many fine observations in the details. The Syntax, however, is decidedly the weakest part of the book. The comparatively small number of examples from secular sources is particularly striking there. On the other hand—and this undoubtedly deserves our thankful attention—Blass makes ample use of the Shepherd of Hermas, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Clementine literature. This is putting into practice the excellent remark in his grimly humorous dedication to August Fick, where he writes : "The isolation of the New Testament is a bad thing for the interpretation of it, and must be broken down as much as possible."

In very different fashion the latest of the grammarians, James Hope Moulton,¹ has broken down the isolation of the New Testament. He introduces himself modestly as inheritor of the work of his late father, W. F. Moulton, whose English edition of Winer's Grammar² had for almost forty years favourably influenced exegetical studies in England and America. His aged mother, who compiled the copious index of texts for him as she had done forty years before for her husband, may symbolize to us the personal continuity between the elder and the younger generation of grammarians. The son has inherited firstly the scholar's instinct for research, united with fervent love of the New Testament. He has further inherited the solid foundation of the book itself, Winer and Moulton's Grammar. But he was also equipped with a modern training in Greek, and by his own industry he has created on that foundation an entirely new

¹ See above.

² Edinburgh, 1870.

book. In the second edition, therefore, which was called for within a few months, the title has rightly been simplified.¹ The first volume bears the descriptive title of *Prolegomena*; a second volume, containing the grammar proper, is yet to follow. With intentional avoidance of systematic severity and concision the nine chapters of the *Prolegomena* aim at making clear by a selection of especially striking linguistic phenomena the general character of the Hellenistic cosmopolitan language and the position of the New Testament in the history of that language. These chapters are partly based on earlier publications of the author's in the *EXPOSITOR*, and his articles in the *Classical Review* are also made use of. What the learned doctinaire may carp at as a fault in the character of the first volume, is for the reader, and especially for the young reader, a great advantage. The opinion that a Grammar can only be good if it is dull, is completely refuted by these *Prolegomena*. You can really read Moulton. You are not stifled in the close air of exegetical controversy, and you are not overwhelmed in a flood of quotations. The main facts and the main questions are always seen distinctly and formulated clearly. It is an important work, in many points stimulating to research, and it should leave one great conviction behind it, namely, that the New Testament, from the linguistic point of view, stands in most vital connexion with the Hellenistic world surrounding it. The earlier grammatical treatment of our sacred Book was above all dominated by a sense of its *contrast* with the surrounding world, and the new method, conceived and followed more energetically by Moulton than by Schmiedel and Blass, emphasizes above all the *contact* with the surrounding world. The last word has not yet been said about the proportion of Semiticisms. A large

¹ *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by James Hope Moulton, vol. i., *Prolegomena*, Edinburgh, 1906.

number of misconceptions in earlier exegetists come from failure to notice the fact that the speech of the people in Greek and in non-Greek languages had many points in common. Thus many phrases which strike both the classical Greek scholar with his public school and university training and the divinity Hebrew scholar, and which they triumphantly brand as Semiticisms, are not always Semiticisms, but often international vulgarisms, which do not justify the isolation of "New Testament" philology.

Excellent indices—only the Greek one is too modest—afford a convenient summary of the results of the Prolegomena. The list of papyri and inscriptions quoted shows the author's wide reading and makes it possible to use the New Testament as a source for the study of papyri and epigraphy. The accuracy of the printing and the beautiful get-up of the book are very pleasing. The only thing that caused me misgivings was the praise given to a German scholar who had lighted by chance upon the papyri and there seen what of course would have been seen by anybody else.

It is to be hoped that the publication of these three great works, to be followed, as already mentioned, by a fourth, does not mean that the grammatical study of the New Testament will come to a standstill for a time. There are plenty of detached problems, both in accidence and syntax ; for example, it seems to me that a close examination of the syntax of the prepositions and cases, especially in St. Paul, would be particularly desirable and fruitful.

In his inaugural lecture at Manchester last year on "The Science of Language and the Study of the New Testament,"¹ Moulton gave a short sketch of the present state of New Testament problems.

Edwin A. Abbott's *Johannine Grammar*,² a special

¹ Manchester, 1906, pp. 32.

² E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar*, London, 1906.

Grammar of the writings of St. John, which appeared recently, is a work of great merit. I have not yet been able to examine this book, nor the same author's *Johannine Vocabulary*,¹ but I can rely upon the opinion of James Hope Moulton, who praises the book highly and would only have liked to see in it a closer acquaintance with the facts of late Greek.

Two detached investigations, not, however, purely grammatical, are contained in two Heidelberg dissertations presented for the licentiate in theology, by Arnold Steubing² on the Pauline concept of "sufferings of Christ," and by Adolph Schettler³ on the Pauline formula "Through Christ." The latter especially is very instructive, and by proving that St. Paul in that formula always means the risen Lord constitutes a great simplification and deepening of our conception of the personal religion of St. Paul.

An American book from the earlier years of the modern period of research, Ernest de Witt Burton's *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*,⁴ deserves honourable mention, while the two very detailed grammatical works of the French Abbé, Joseph Viteau,⁵ entitled *Études sur le Grec du Nouveau Testament*, must be used with great caution. Burton's book has moreover been recently

¹ E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Vocabulary*: a comparison of the words of the Fourth Gospel with those of the three. London, 1905.

² Arnold Steubing, *Der paulinische Begriff "Christusleiden,"* Darmstadt, 1905.

³ Adolph Schettler, *Die paulinische Formel "Durch Christus,"* Tübingen, 1907.

⁴ E. de Witt Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*, Chicago, 1893; 2nd ed., London (Isbister), 1893; 3rd ed., Edinburgh, 1898.

⁵ Joseph Viteau, *Études sur le Grec du Nouveau Testament. Le Verbe : Syntaxe des Propositions.* (Thèse.) Paris, 1893.—*Étude sur le grec du Nouveau Testament comparé avec celui des Septante : Sujet, Complément et Attribut.* Paris, 1896. (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, fasc. 114.)

translated into Dutch by J. de Zwaan,¹ a Dutchman, who enriched it with good additions of his own. As a proof that also the Roman Catholic Church in German lands is at least not wanting in good will to assist in this grammatical work I may mention two "Programms" by Alois Theimer,² an Austrian schoolmaster, on the prepositions in the historical books of the New Testament.

The greatest task for the philologist of the New Testament is again a Dictionary. Excellent in the main as was Wilibald Grimm's revision³ of Wilke's *Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica* (as may be seen especially in the much more correct English edition by Joseph Henry Thayer), and much as Cremer's *Lexicon* has improved in the course of years, both these works, Grimm and Cremer, to say nothing of others, are no longer adequate. We now have the right to expect of a Dictionary that it shall take account of the results of modern philology, and that it therefore in particular should not ignore the splendid additions to our knowledge due to the discoveries of the last twenty or thirty years. As far as the inscriptions are concerned, both Grimm and Cremer might have derived much information from them, and it is regrettable that they did not do so. Already a large number of words formerly considered "Biblical" or "New Testament" can be struck off the list on the authority of inscriptions, papyri, or passages in authors that had escaped notice.

It used to be a favourite amusement of the older lexico-

¹ J. de Zwaan, *Syntaxis der Wijzen en Tijden in het Grieksche Nieuwe Testament . . .*, Haarlem, 1906.

² *Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Sprachgebrauches im Neuen Testamente*, Programm, Horn in Niederösterreich, 1896 and 1901.

³ C. G. Wilke, *Clavis Novi Testamenti Philologica*, Dresdae et Lipsiae, 1841, 2 vols.; another, Roman Catholic edition, *Lexicon Graeco-Latinum in libros Novi Testamenti*, by V. Loch, Ratisbonae, 1858; another Protestant edition by C. L. W. Grimm, Lipsiae, 1868, vierte Auflage, 1903; translated by J. H. Thayer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, Edinburgh, 1886; New York, 1887.

graphers to distinguish words as specifically Biblical or New Testament, and the number of such words has been enormously overestimated. Even Kennedy¹ calculates, from the lists in Thayer's Lexicon, that among the 4,800 to 5,000 words used in the New Testament (omitting proper names), about 550 are "Biblical," that is, words "found either in the New Testament alone, or, besides, only in the Septuagint. That is, about twelve per cent. of the total vocabulary of New Testament is 'Biblical.' " But this estimate will not bear close examination.

Many of these 550 words are quoted by Thayer himself from non-Christian authors, and though these authors are often post-Christian, there is no probability of their having learnt the words from the New Testament or from the mouth of Christians. A large number of other words have since then turned up in the inscriptions, papyri, and ostraca, and as regards the rest we must always ask in each case whether there is sufficient internal reason for supposing the word to be a Christian invention. Where one of these words is not recognizable at sight as a Jewish or Christian new formation we must consider it as a word common to all Greek until the contrary is proved.

The number of really new-coined words is in the earliest Christian period very small. There can hardly be more than 50 Christian new formations among the round 5,000 words of the New Testament vocabulary, that is, not 12 per cent. but 1 per cent. Primitive Christianity was a revolution of the inmost life of man, but not a revolution of the Greek lexicon—so might we, as modern philologists, vary the old witness of St. Paul, that "the kingdom of God is not in word but in power" (1 Cor. iv. 20). The great enriching of the Greek lexicon by Christianity did not take place till later, in the ecclesiastical period, with its enormous

¹ P. 93. See above.



development and differentiation of the dogmatic, liturgical, and legal vocabulary. In the religiously creative period the power of Christianity to form new words was not nearly so large as its effect in transforming the meaning of the old words.

The New Testament lexicographer will therefore have to make himself familiar above all with the great range of sources for the Greek popular language from Alexander the Great to Constantine. His field is the world—that world which from the most ancient seats of Greek culture in Hellas and in the islands, in the little country towns of Asia Minor and in the villages of Egypt, as well as from the cosmopolitan trading centres on the shores of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, presents us year by year with memorials of itself, i.e., with actual documents of the living language which was the missionary language of St. Paul.

Studies such as those of E. L. Hicks in the *Classical Review*,¹ James Hope Moulton's lexical work in the *EXPOSITOR*,² Theodor Nägeli's *Examination of the Vocabulary of the Apostle Paul*,³ Wilhelm Heitmüller's book⁴ on the formula "in the name of Jesus," Gottfried Thieme's Heidelberg dissertation on *The Inscriptions of Magnesia on the Maeander and the New Testament*,⁵ Wendland's essay on the word Saviour (σωτήρ),⁶ have all by this method obtained accurate results and laid the foundations for the future new Lexicon. Georg Heinrici⁷ in his examination of the Sermon

¹ See above.

² Vol. i., 1887, pp. 4-8, 42-46.

³ April, 1901; February, 1903; December, 1903.

⁴ W. Heitmüller, *Im Namen Jesu*, Göttingen, 1905.

⁵ G. Thieme, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Mäander und das Neue Testament*, Göttingen, 1906.

⁶ *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1904, v., pp. 335-353.

⁷ Georg Heinrici, *Die Bergpredigt . . . begriffsgeschichtlich untersucht*, Reformationsfestprogramm, Leipzig, 1905 (and as vol. iii. of Heinrici's *Beiträge*, Leipzig, 1905).

on the Mount from the point of view of the history of ideas has made valuable contributions by drawing materials from the old philosophical and ethical writers. Baljon ¹ also, at least in the Appendix to his Dictionary, was able to incorporate some of the results of recent investigations. It will also be possible for synonymic studies to receive a new impetus from the new sources. Archbishop Trench's ² well-known work is the classical representative of the older philological method. Though in many points out of date, it is still the best work on New Testament synonymy, and a selection from it has just been published in a German translation by Heinrich Werner.³ The German *Synonymy of New Testament Greek* by Gerhard Heine ⁴ is quite elementary.

Any one who shall in future pursue studies in synonymy based on an intimate knowledge of the late Greek popular language, will without doubt come to the conclusion that the stock of concepts possessed by Primitive Christianity was much more simple and transparent than used formerly to be assumed. The concepts have hitherto been too much isolated; for example, the differences between "Justification," "Reconciliation," and "Redemption" in St. Paul have been much more strongly emphasized than the relationship which before all things is recognizable between them. In particular the personality and the piety of the Apostle Paul appear much more compact and more impressive, if, avoiding the failings of the doctrinaire method as commonly employed in Germany by the Tübingen School

¹ See above.

² R. C. Trench, *Synonyms of the New Testament*, Cambridge, 1854 7th ed., 1871, last edition 1906.

³ *Synonyma des Neuen Testaments*, von R. Ch. Trench, ausgewählt und übersetzt von Heinrich Werner. Mit einem Vorwort von Prof. D. Adolf Deissmann. Tübingen, 1907.

⁴ Gerhard Heine, *Synonymik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Leipzig, 1898.

and their opponents, we consider him against the background recoverable from the new sources of the Graeco-Roman world as the great hero of the faith from the East.

Finally, there is great need for critical studies of the style of the separate books of the New Testament. In Eduard Norden's book ¹ on *The Artistic Prose of the Ancients* will be found a number of fine observations, although his whole procedure in connecting the New Testament with Greek *artistic* prose is not correct. The greater part of the New Testament writings is not artistic prose but artless popular prose; which, however, is often of greater natural beauty than the artificial products of the hollow rhetoric of post-classical antiquity. The words of Jesus and many utterances of St. Paul and the other apostles are either instinct with a calm, chaste beauty that is æsthetically worthy of admiration, or else they are written with truly lapidary force, worthy of marble and the chisel. The importance of the New Testament in the history of style rests on the fact that through this book the language of natural life, that is, of course, language as it lived upon lips specially endowed by grace, made its entry into a world of outworn doctrine and empty rhetoric. It was a great mistake of Friedrich Blass ² to try to represent St. Paul as an adherent of the Asian rhythm, so that, for example, the Epistle to the Galatians would be supposed to be written with due observance of the rhythmical rules of art. This error ranges Blass with a number of older writers by whom the Apostle Paul was praised for his great knowledge of classical literature.

Primitive Christianity—this is one of the main results of the modern philology of the New Testament—Primitive

¹ Eduard Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom vi. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, Leipzig, 1898.

² F. Blass, *Die Rhythmen der asianischen und römischen Kunstprosa*, Leipzig, 1905. See *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1906, xxxi., col. 231 ff.

Christianity in its classical epoch is set in the midst of the world, but it still has very little connexion with official culture ; indeed, as an energetic and one-sided religious movement it is distrustful in its attitude towards the “ wisdom ” of the world.

It rejects—this is the second result of our inquiry—it rejects, in this epoch, all the outward devices of rhetoric. In grammar, vocabulary, syntax, and style it occupies a place in the midst of the people and draws from the inexhaustible soil of the popular element to which it was native a good share of its youthful strength.

In opposition to its later developments towards dogma, differentiation, and complexity—and this is the third result—in opposition to these later developments it is, in that classical epoch, in spite of the glowing enthusiasm of its hope, entirely simple and forceful, intelligible in its appeal to the simple and the poor in spirit, and therefore appointed to a mission to the whole world.

Modern New Testament philology, therefore—I may say in conclusion—does not mean any impoverishing of our conceptions of the beginnings of our faith. On the contrary, although apparently concerned only with the outward form of the New Testament, it opens up new points of view as regards its inward meaning, deepening our knowledge of Primitive Christianity and strengthening our love of the New Testament.

And if this study has brought together a band of workers from all Protestant countries on one common field—workers whom enthusiasm for Christ and His Cause and the desire for knowledge have united in one great brotherhood—then the philology of the New Testament, with this international alliance in work, is helping in little to fulfil the great hope of the New Testament “ that we may all be one in Christ.”

ADOLF DEISSMANN.

*OPERA FORIS.**MATERIALS FOR THE PREACHER.*

I.

IN the present series of studies I have agreed to furnish some materials of exposition for the special benefit of the preacher. He is apt to be overlooked in the market place of modern criticism, where the details of historical, grammatical, textual, and literary research are displayed to the technical student with an eagerness and a thoroughness which threaten to crowd out any humble attempt to cater for the man whose business leads him to interpret and apply the Scriptures as freshly as he can. He may be too conscientious to fall back on ready-made homiletic material. He may preserve himself incorruptible and independent. Yet his integrity is not always rewarded, as it should be, by his fellow-workers in Biblical criticism. They repeatedly come across items of exegetical interest in their researches, but sometimes they forget to bring these home and lay them out for the less travelled preacher. This seems a pity, and it has, therefore, been thought that a modest and tentative attempt might be made, in the pages of the EXPOSITOR, to furnish from time to time several texts on which the preacher may spread his tent, or round which there may have collected fresh materials of a suggestive character from the outlying provinces of scholarship and general literature.

Præpara foris opus tuum, says the Hebrew proverb in the Vulgate, *et diligenter exerce agrum tuum : ut postea ædifices domum tuam*. The newer developments of historical science, in the departments of Semitic and early Christian history, offer constant proof of the spoils, minor and significant, which can be conveyed to the interpretation of Scripture from outside fields. These hints, illustrations, and results are the preacher's *opera foris*, his works done outside. He

may not have the leisure or the capacity to secure them always for himself. The complexity of the modern ministry tells against this in many quarters. But he should be able to reckon upon the co-operation of others, whose interests take them occasionally into these outlying provinces, and to receive at their hands the contributions, linguistic, literary, or archæological, which he can employ to build up strongly and tastefully his house of interpretation. The same holds true of modern history, psychology, and literature. These also, when carefully explored, sometimes even when casually surveyed, will have their *opera foris* for the preacher ; they teem with suggestions and illustrations which, though apparently remote from his proper business, can be carried home and wrought up skilfully for higher uses. And these higher uses concentrate in the effective presentment of the religious message which the Scriptures contain as a shelter for mankind.

The recognition of this forms quite a remarkable feature of recent Biblical criticism, both on the Continent and in this country. The negative period is closing, and the need of positive religious teaching is being felt and met increasingly. Thus, a new handbook to the New Testament is being published in Tübingen by six scholars (*Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, J. C. B. Mohr), whose avowed purpose is to combine unprejudiced exposition with a critical popular commentary on the text. This object is steadily kept in view, and the full statement of it is entrusted to the competent hands of Herr Niebergall, who has already shown his interest and capacity in a volume, *Wie predigen wir dem modernen Menschen?* From Niebergall's recent essay in this Handbook we may take the following significant words. "We are heartily grateful to the critical and historical treatment of Scripture in our own day. For all the disquiet into which it has plunged us, for all the pro-

longed toil which it has imposed on us, we could not dispense with it. The misty veil drawn by tradition over the New Testament has indeed been destroyed, but that is all ; and in its place we have been enabled to secure a knowledge of the greatness of the New Testament which we would not miss for anything. We come under the impression of a great and sterling spiritual power," whose voice is one, however different are the tones of its utterance through one character and another. Hence, Niebergall proceeds to argue, the religious unity of the New Testament, so far from evaporating the characteristic historical differences of its writers, really enables us to interpret these aright, and at the same time, while doing justice to them, to conserve the salient and vital elements of the revelation which the preacher finds verified in history and experience. For any one who has understood this dominating spirit of the Scriptures, "discrepancies, unauthentic traditions, interpolations, errors of translation," and all the rest of it, drop into their proper place. The notice they attract is out of all proportion to their significance. "Through all differences in the historical narratives and doctrinal representations, we feel we are constantly within the very soul and spirit of this unique Power. Here the synoptic differences disappear, the great figure of Jesus, strong and tender, shines out upon the soul, the Johannine Christ approximates to the synoptic Jesus, and both figures, despite all differences, unite in one great human figure, in the figure of One through whom the power and the grace of God operate. Paul and James blend in one supreme, spiritual power, and even the wild ardour of John's Revelation combines with all the rest to form a brilliant flame of the Spirit. For the critical reader each epistle and writing may retain its characteristic flavour, but far above any trivial adjustment of the letter these mighty spirits all harmonize in one Spirit which becomes

more impressive and unique than ever, the more one is engrossed with it." ■

This passage brings out the timeless element and the spiritual unity in the Scriptures, which their historical variety only serves to emphasize. The *opera foris* of the preacher may be scattered here and there. From many sides they have to be gathered. But, as Niebergall confesses, for all their variety they run up into a real and religious unity. The interpreter's house can be furnished with them, and it will be all the more habitable as it is constructed wisely and generously out of such materials, ancient and modern.

Such is the design of the following papers : not to do the preacher's work for him, but perhaps to enable him to do his work, now and then, more freshly and easily and effectively. The house is the sermon. If it is to be of any service, it must be his own, and he must build it himself. But he may honestly welcome and adapt some stones which have been quarried from outlying fields of reading and research.

* * * * *

The verse (Prov. xxiv. 27) itself contains some pregnant suggestions for the preacher :

*Prepare thy work without,
and make it ready for thee in the field ;
and afterwards build thine house.*

The book of Proverbs revolves round the two problems of work and temptation ; sometimes, as here, it is one's work which brings temptations into life. The first of these is impatience. The house is not built by a hot rush ! Preliminary work has to be done ; stones must be quarried, and bricks dug, laboriously, often at a considerable distance from the chosen site. *Outside, in the field* which may lie out of sight of the building's foundation, many of the pre-

parations must be made for the final erection. So with all education. Lessons have to be learned, and fields of study laboured, which at the time seem to have no bearing upon life's real business ; yet eventually it is found that these unromantic pursuits have contributed to the efficiency of character. Similarly with the discipline of the soul. Out-of-the-way experiences are often imposed on people, but the long result, with its accumulation of insight and training of the faculties, will justify their divine connection with the central plan. The true character, like the best work, cannot be hastily improvised. It turns out to depend upon many factors, some of which originally may have seemed to have no very direct bearing on the main issue. This proverb is a reminder that all such apparently meaningless tasks and experiences are to be taken without impatience, in the faith that they will contribute eventually to the building of one's life.

The companion warning is against indolence. After all, a house has to be built ; preparations are meant to end in some positive achievement. *And afterwards build !* The test of the field work is the house, and there is a temptation to be slack in facing this test. In literature, in art, or in character, to create is the object of life ; yet there is a disposition to ignore it. The artist is wise in sketching here and there, getting hints and suggestions as he roams far and wide. But his end is not to wander with a portfolio full of unfinished, dilettante sketches.¹ Similarly, the wide work

¹ The mention of an artist reminds one of two apposite passages, one from the twelfth of Sir Joshua Reynolds' Discourses, the other from R. L. Stevenson's essay on Fontainebleau. The former runs thus : "I have known artists who may truly be said to have spent their whole lives, or at least the most precious part of their lives, in planning methods of study, without ever beginning ; resolving, however, to put it all in practice at some time or other—when a certain period arrives—when proper conveniences are procured—or when they remove to a certain place better calculated for study," etc. The latter passage begins : "The time comes

of preparation, reading and listening and observing, must not be taken as the be-all and end-all of life. Some practical outcome, in the shape of character and definite service, is the goal of culture and experience. There must be the will to act, to create, to serve. And so the proverb is also a warning against the graceful, nerveless indolence which fritters away its time and powers in dreaming of some great work, and yet, from timidity or fastidiousness or procrastination, hesitates to undertake any practical concern. *Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them* (instead of either forgetting or merely admiring them), *I will liken him to a wise man which built his house.*

* * * * *

Psalm lxxiii. 15 : *If I had said, I will speak thus ; behold, I had dealt treacherously with the generation of thy children.* (R.V.).

An illustration of wise reticence about one's religious doubts. The psalmist was driven to entertain bitter reflection about God's goodness. He wondered to himself whether it was any use to continue serving God with inward sincerity and outward worship (ver. 13), when piety was so poorly rewarded in the matter of health and success. But he had grace to keep his doubts to himself. He burned his own smoke, and now, looking back on the moral crisis through which he had passed, he is thankful that at least he had not shaken the faith of any one else. He had, indeed, been tempted to parade his doubts. Intellectual superiority prompts some to do so ; a weak craving for sympathy induces others. But what saved the psalmist from this temptation was his fine sense of corporate responsibility. It would

when a man should cease prelusory gymnastics, stand up, put a violence upon his will, and, for better or worse, begin the business of creation. This evil day there is a tendency continually to postpone ; above all with painters. They have made so many studies that it has become a habit. This class of man finds a congenial home in artist villages."

have been a breach of faith to scatter suspicions of God's faithfulness and justice among the other members of the household, poisoning or disturbing their simple trust in His integrity. The perplexed man must remember that he owes a duty of consideration to these people.¹ As a rule earnest prayer to God (ver. 17) and silence before others will avail to steady the disturbed heart. Compare Matthew xviii. 6, and Tennyson's *In Memoriam*, xxxiii :

Leave thou thy sister, when she prays,
Her early Heaven, her happy views ;
Nor thou with shadowed hint confuse
A life that leads melodious days.

The closing verse of the psalm gives the writer's mature judgment upon the matter. *I have made the Lord God my refuge, that I may tell of all thy works* (literally, *Thy occupations, Thy business*). What the church needs is the proclamation not of man's doubts but of God's deeds. Positive convictions of a good God are the end which alone justifies any one in speaking to his fellows upon the problem of human faith.

* * * * *

Isaiah lvi. 8 and 12.

The religious and the secular programmes. A new stratum of prophecy seems to begin at verse 9 ; but even if the juxtaposition of these two verses is due to an editor, it offers a sufficiently remarkable contrast of ideals. The earlier verse is the close of a prophetic fragment anticipating, with generous enthusiasm, the addition of foreign converts to the community of Israel. *The Lord God which gathereth the outcasts of Israel saith, Yet will I gather others to him, beside*

¹ This is, of course, very different from the somewhat cynical remark made by Northcote the painter to Godwin when the latter had been trying to unsettle the opinions of a young artist. "Why should you wish to turn him out of one house, till you have provided another for him ? Besides, what do you know of the matter more than he does ? His nonsense is as good as your nonsense, when both are equally in the dark."

those that are gathered to him. This represents the spiritual disinterested ardour of a church looking forward to ever greater results of its divine mission among men. The best thing to be hoped for is this experience of God gathering in the outcast to His fellowship. That sums up the good time coming ; that alone is fitted to kindle enthusiasm and hope among the faithful servants of God and man.

But there is a lower side, even in the contemporary life of the church. The next paragraph describes, in severe terms, the idle and profane lives of those who ought to be Israel's leaders in the religious movement. Their ruling passion is not unselfish missionary ardour, but self-interest. Greedy, lazy, and stupid (verses 10-11), they are intent merely upon what advances their own professional ends. Their motto, as they banquet together, is : *To-morrow shall be as this day, and much more abundant.* They too anticipate a good time coming. But it is a future of selfish and material pleasures.

A similar contrast is visible in John x. 16 and xii. 49-52.

* * * * *

In a recent number of Preuschen's *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1907, 143-161), Wilhelm Wagner has offered an ingenious interpretation of Mark x. 17-22 (=Matt. xix. 16-22, Luke xviii. 18-23), which suggests several things to the preacher. He begins, of course, by taking the version of Mark and Luke as more original than that of Matthew. The anonymous rich man said, not *τι ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω κτλ.*, but *διδάσκαλε ἀγαθέ, τί ποιήσω κτλ.* Jesus replied, not *τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός*, but *τι με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός.* This is generally recognized by most scholars nowadays. But Wagner, after reviewing the various explanations of the difficulty thus created, proceeds to argue that the term *ἀγαθός* should be taken in its familiar

sense of "kindly" or "gracious" (=נָחֵם), as e.g. in Psalm xxv. 8 ("good and upright is the Lord, therefore will he teach sinners the way"); ¹ xxxiv. 8 ("O taste and see that the Lord is good"), etc. The LXX, it is true, prefers to translate the term in such passages by χρηστός ("benignant"), but Philo employs ἀγαθός in this sense, and it is noticeable that in the only other place where Jesus uses this adjective in connexion with God, its meaning denotes not moral perfection but gracious disposition. In the parable of the labourers in the vineyard (Matt. xx. 1-16), where the character of the owner is meant to adumbrate God's dealings with men, the owner pleads "I am good (ἀγαθός)." Obviously goodness here means a royal graciousness. The point of the parable is that God deals generously with men; He is good to them, liberal, generous.

Wagner wonders if the passage in Mark's Gospel should not be read in this light.² The inquirer asked a great favour of Jesus ("good teacher"). He wished the Galilean rabbi to be so kind as to solve for him a very serious difficulty. "Pray, be good enough to tell me." But, Wagner continues, it is possible that Jesus felt a certain false deference in the address (compare his reference to the εὐεργέται, Luke xxii. 25), as though it suggested the servile attitude adopted by contemporaries to Jewish rabbis (Matt. xxiii. 6 f.) and pagan authorities. These were not the fount of favours or

¹ The point of Christ's reply to the young man would then be, not that God's goodness was revealed in the content of the commandments, but that the entire revelation of the law, the very fact that He had disclosed the way to life eternal, proved His goodness to mankind.

² Wagner's further attempt to show that Justin Martyr read the logion in this sense, is quite unconvincing, however. Justin does quote the passage with the addition of ὁ παῖς τὰ πάντα τὸν θεόν (Apol. i. 16). But Psalm cxlv. 9 ("The Lord is good to all, and his mercy is over all his works") does not occur in the context, and it is arbitrary to suppose, with Wagner, that such an idea as that of the psalmist was in the Christian father's mind. The addition is due to the monotheistic emphasis which dominates the entire passage.

enlightenment to men. To employ such terms loosely was repugnant to him who sought not his own honour, but God's (John v. 41, vii. 11); consequently he checked the inquirer, and made him revise his terms.¹ Hence in replying, "none is good save God alone," Jesus was not denying his own sinlessness or moral perfection. He was simply reminding the inquirer of God's supreme prerogative of gracious favour as the revealer to men of their duty to Himself and others.

The words would then fall to be read in the light of a saying like that of Psalm cxix. 69 :

*Thou art good, and doest good,
Teach me thy statutes—*

where God's goodness is summed up in His revelation of the law of life to man, as intelligible and attractive. The inquirer in the Gospel learns that God's supreme goodness is now shown in Jesus as the guide of all aspiration and obedience, and that anyone who comes into contact with Him comes under a higher obligation (*follow me*).

* * * * *

Hebrews x. 29 : *Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the custom of some is.*

The neglect of public worship, at which the writer hints, is due not so much to worldly indifference or to a fear of the risks involved in a church connexion, as to the fascination of some other cult. The danger was that these Christians should regard Christianity as a semi-philosophic or religious sect or phase which could be exhausted and then left behind for something higher. The writer insists that it is not one of the contemporary schools or cults. It is final. Beyond its revelation, nothing higher can be looked for, and the Christian must resist any specious attempt to detach

¹ The suggestion has the powerful support of Wellhausen, who, on Mark x. 18, observes : "*ἀγαθός* bedeutet weniger sündlos als gutig." Similarly Dalman : *die Worte Jesu* (pp. 277-278).

him from a close and permanent relationship to the church. Compare Harnack's remark (*History of Dogma*, vol. i. p. 151, note 1): "If we remember how the Greeks and Romans were wont to get themselves initiated into a mystery cult, and took part for a long time in the religious exercises, and then, when they thought they had got the good of it, for the most part or wholly to give up attending it, we shall not wonder that the demand to become a permanent member of a Christian community was opposed by many." This is elaborated in the same writer's *Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums* (1st ed. pp. 312 f., Eng. tr. ii. pp. 50 f.), and Hatch has some apposite remarks upon it in his *Organization of the Early Christian Churches* (pp. 29-30). The historical point of the saying is unmistakable. But modern civilization offers instances of the same tendency to regard the worship and revelation of Jesus as a phase which requires to be supplemented. There are people to-day who, from the same motives of vainglory and untrained curiosity, imagine that they have exhausted Christianity, or that they can secure and appropriate for higher ends its spiritual content. The words of this verse reiterate, as the rest of the Epistle does, the finality of Jesus Christ for men, and the truth that no advance of humanity can afford to dispense with Him.

For God has other words for other worlds,
 But for this world the Word of God is Christ . . .
 Who is there that can say, "My part is done
 In this: now I am ready for a law
 More wide, more perfect for the rest of life?"

Forsake not, do not abandon, your tie with other Christians, the writer pleads. It is a strain, in view of the centrifugal tendencies of the world, to maintain Christian fellowship, but it is a healthy strain, for this effort keeps you in touch with all that is central and satisfying in religion. A movement whose motto is "A greater than Christ" may be imposing and seductive, but it has no future in this world of God and of his Christ.

JAMES MOFFATT.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES ON THE NEW ARAMAIC PAPYRI.

THE Jewish colony, which was settled on the southern border of Egypt, partly at Syene and partly at Elephantine, which lies opposite to it, gained a new importance when Professor Sachau's three Aramaic papyri threw such unexpected light upon the temple and its history. The discovery is so recent that it would be wrong to suppose that its bearing upon biblical studies can be decided off-hand, and one of the objects of the present supplementary remarks is to indicate rather more carefully than in my preliminary account some considerations which have to be borne in mind in approaching the new evidence.

In addition to the articles by Professor Margoliouth and Mr. Griffith (EXPOSITOR, pp. 481-496) a carefully annotated translation was contributed by Professor Driver to the *Guardian* of November 6.¹ Professor Clermont-Ganneau has published a number of notes in his own *Recueil d'Archéologie Orientale* (vol. viii. § 21), and some useful suggestions have been made by Dr. Fraenkel in a review of the texts in the *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, no. 24, November 23. It may be useful, therefore, to start with a few remarks on points of detail affecting the *translation*.²

Professor Ganneau's translation of the words at the end of line 8 (viz. crowbars or the like) is in practical agreement with that suggested by Professor Margoliouth (p. 484 n. 5). The puzzling epithets applied to the commander Widrang

¹ I regret that his valuable article did not come under my notice until after my own account had been despatched for press.

² I may mention incidentally that in my translation of the opening words ("to our lord Bagoḥi the governor of Judah," p. 499), I preferred to maintain the distinction between *Jēhūd* and the ethnic Judaeans or Jews, and that I rendered the same word by "lord" or "Lord," whereas Prof. Margoliouth has preferred to use "master" for the former.

or Waidrang—whose name is not so uncertain as I supposed—have not been conclusively explained (see above, pp. 484 n. 4, 485 n. 7).

In support of Professor Sachau's suggestion that they indicate his origin (viz. a man of Lehi, of Caleb), one can point to a long-known papyrus from Elephantine where reference appears to be made to Jedoniah the Geshurite (cf. Josh. xiii. 2). On the other hand, it had been tempting at the outset to recognize a touch of contempt, and I had been inclined to render the phrases "this miserable (or wicked) W.," "this hound W." Since this has also suggested itself independently to Professor Ganneau, it may be put forward with more confidence. But it is not to be accepted hastily, because the third papyrus, which is a memorandum of the instructions of Bagoas and Delaiah, refers to the altar-house "which this miserable (?) W. had destroyed." Here the question is at once raised whether this wording would express the opinion of the governor of Judah or the writer's own feelings, and it will be perceived that this point bears upon the internal character of the official communications quoted or referred to in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah.

In regard to the destruction of the temple, the papyri describe the breaking of the stone pillars and the destruction of the seven (so the duplicate) stone portals. The words that follow—"they set up their heads"—yield no sense (p. 485 n. 3), and Professor Ganneau has proposed the very suitable reading "they removed their doors." His rendering of the verb finds support in colloquial Arabic, and his reading of the noun, both here and in the following line (instead of "marbles"), is not only thoroughly defensible but had been proposed independently by Mr. Cowley (in Professor Driver's article) and also by Dr. Fraenkel.

The fate of the hinges (Fraenkel refers to 2 Chron. iv.

9), the cedar-wood roofing (?) and all the rest (?) of the building is not so obvious. It is certain that the Egyptians carried away the precious vessels, and Professor Ganneau suggests that they also "removed" the bronze hinges and cedar-wood which were surely too useful to be wantonly destroyed. According to this, it was only after everything had been broken or looted that the palace was given over to the flames; and although it is not clear whether "the stucco (?) of the wall (?) " belongs to the things carried away, or whether the rest (?) of the building (?) "—so the alternative suggestion—was burned together with "whatever else was there," Professor Ganneau's remarks are, as usual, both clever and suggestive.

Widrang's fate still remains obscure—"they brought forth the ring (or his rings, so the duplicate) from his feet," but for "ring," anklets, fetters and even ankle-bones have been suggested, and it is just possible that "feet" is to be connected with the *crux* in the papyri edited by Professor Sayce and Mr. Cowley.

As regards the failure of the writers to receive a reply from Jerusalem, it may be noticed that the papyri do not state distinctly the subject to the verb, "[they] sent no letter unto us." The Judaeans nobles may be meant; at all events, while some contrast is clearly intended, the necessary English word "but" is too emphatic, the original simply having "and."

Finally, the enormous grant which the writers were apparently ready to offer can hardly fail to arouse comment (pp. 487, 496); the terms are not very explicitly stated, and another explanation may be forthcoming.

To turn now from these details to the larger questions involved by the new discovery, it is important to remember at the outset that even the most objective and tangible of evidence is none the less liable to unsound or erroneous

interpretation, and when the interpretation is to be fitted into an historical frame the risk of error is greater, and the most comprehensive examination is more urgently needed. For example, it was at once evident that the reference in the Berlin papyri to the treatment of the Egyptian temples by Cambyses was somewhat perplexing. The Jews mention the incident in order to strengthen their appeal to the Persian Governor, but we have, on the authority of the Egyptian officer, Uza-hor, good evidence which throws another light upon the attitude of Persia to Egyptian religion under both Cambyses and Darius. It is not easy to see at once how the evidence is to be reconciled.¹

The true bearing of the papyri upon the history of Ezra and Nehemiah, too, can scarcely be estimated until the different groups of evidence have been re-investigated. Professor Margoliouth's more detailed remarks (pp. 487 seq.) will have shown both the very close relation between the sources which bear upon Bagoas, Sanballat and the Samaritans, and the very complicated chronological questions which arise. It is extremely unlikely that Nehemiah xiii. and Josephus are referring to two distinct events in the history of Judah and Samaria. Great obscurity hung over the whole of the Persian age, and it is very easy to see now how confusion could have arisen from incorrect identification of kings, governors and high-priests bearing identical names (cf. p. 492). It is quite unnecessary, at all events, to reduce "several detailed chapters of Josephus to fiction," because even the most trustworthy record must have some basis, and this historian gives certain details which strongly suggest that his worst offence, per-

¹ See Mr. Griffith's remarks on p. 494, and his account of Uza-hor in Hogarth's *Authority and Archaeology*, p. 179 seq.; it will be necessary to know more of the madness of Cambyses and his unsuccessful expedition against the Ethiopians before any opinion can be ventured.

haps, was to misunderstand or confuse extant traditions or sources.

Besides, it is noteworthy that Josephus treats the history of Ezra and Nehemiah in a manner which suggests that he did not have the biblical books before him in their present form. Upon these problems of historical and literary criticism Professor Margoliouth has touched only incidentally, observing: "Whether the historical character of the book of Ezra—which has been more seriously doubted than that of Nehemiah—will gain by the discovery seems doubtful" (p. 493). Although any detailed remarks upon the biblical sources would be more appropriately presented in a technical study, it is not out of place to emphasize the conclusion that the compiler of the books Ezra and Nehemiah—which at one stage formed part of Chronicles—was either ignorant of or indifferent to the true chronology of the period.¹ The time indications in Nehemiah xiii. are not clear, and would indicate that the Dedication of the Walls of Nehemiah (obviously connected closely with the account of their erection) belonged to his second visit twelve years after his first arrival! Even in the very middle of the building of the walls in fifty-two days there is an account of Nehemiah's reforms in which he refers to his past conduct as governor during twelve years, and proposes to set the nobles an example in refraining from lending on usury (v. 10, 14 seq.). These fifty-two days of building, when reckoned back (ii. 11 and vi. 15), bring us to the date of Nehemiah's arrival in Jerusalem, which turns out to be practically the anniversary of that of Ezra about twelve years previously.² In view of the close relation between these two, this feature appears to be no mere coincidence.

¹ Reference may be made to Prof. G. A. Smith's careful statement of evidence in the *EXPOSITOR*, July, 1906, pp. 1-18.

² According to Josephus it took no less than two years and four months to complete the walls (*Ant.* xi. v. 8).

But although the completion of the walls on the twenty-fifth of the sixth month is doubtless intended to be the prelude to the events in the seventh month, when Ezra suddenly appears (Neh. vii. 73, viii.), there is very good reason to suppose that the substance of Nehemiah xi. originally followed immediately upon vii. 4. That is to say, underneath an apparently united and consecutive narrative there are details which show that in the book of Nehemiah, as in that of Ezra, we are very much in the hands of compilers who had specific views of the sequence of events, and that these views must be carefully examined.

Without more complete external evidence, however, it seems impossible to find any hypothesis which shall give an adequate explanation of all the narratives. It would, at least, be hazardous to build or rebuild any historical reconstruction upon the Berlin papyri. They do not confirm the remarkable powers bestowed by Artaxerxes upon Ezra (vii. 11-26), although they do suggest how an authentic document could form the basis of a more patriotic and less objective representation of a royal mandate (cf. also Ezra vi. 3-5 with i. 1 sqq.). Even if the papyri betray no knowledge of hostility between Jerusalem and Samaria, they do not provide conclusive or controlling evidence to permit an immediate decision as to which of a number of possible explanations is really the best. Moreover, it would be quite unsafe to venture behind them and attempt to draw all kinds of inferences as to the precise character of the religious ideas which prevailed among the writers.

It had previously been recognized from the texts edited by Professor Sayce and Mr. Cowley that there was no objection to pronouncing the *nomen ineffabile* in ordinary life, and that an oath could be taken by a Jewess before the heathen goddess Sati (see p. 499).¹ It had already been

¹ I. Lévi (*Revue des Etudes Juives*, 1907, p. 44, n. 4) appropriately

apparent that the community did not feel itself bound by the law of the single sanctuary at Jerusalem, and it was a Jewish scholar who was impressed by "the surprising phenomena which the Syene papyri reveal with regard to certain religious conditions."¹ With the new evidence before us for the practice of sacrificial and other religious rites it would be illegitimate to make any far-reaching deductions. So striking are the data that Dr. Redpath, remarking upon the lapse of the community "into a very lax form of religion," and thinking it incredible that they were pure-bred Jews, favours the view that the community was of Samaritan origin (*The Guardian*, Nov. 13). Mr. G. A. Hollis (*ibid.* Nov. 27), on the other hand, suggests that Jehoahaz and doubtless some of his nobles had been removed by Pharaoh Necho to the distant fortress in the south of Egypt, and he reminds us that when Psammetichus invaded Ethiopia Jewish soldiers accompanied his army. This writer's suggestive remarks merit fuller consideration, and he conjectures that the death of the reforming king Josiah was followed by a violent reaction and that Jehoahaz and his associates may have returned to the freedom of worship of earlier days.

These questions are involved with the history of the last kings of the Judæan monarchy and the independent evidence furnished by the prophecies of Jeremiah. Professor Sachau notes that the Jewish refugees in Egypt do not appear to have felt that longing to return to their country which the prophet anticipated (Jer. xlv. 14). Jeremiah denounces

cites the Talmud *Sanhed.* 63b, where the possibility of being obliged to take an oath in the name of another god is a reason for not associating with any one who was not a Jew.

¹ Prof. W. Bacher, *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, 1907, p. 444. See also Father Lagrange, *Rev. Biblique*, July, 1907, p. 270 ("Il est probable qu'ils ne se croyaient pas tenus trop strictement à l'unité du culte"); Prof. Nödeke, *Zeit. f. Assyriol.*, August, 1907, p. 131 ("die forderung des einheitlichen Mittelpunkts für den Kultus galt somit bei diesen Juden noch nicht oder nicht mehr").

them for persisting in the idolatries of their forefathers and even foretells their destruction. It is difficult, therefore, to see on what grounds a distinction could be drawn between the religious conditions of Jews in Upper Egypt in contrast to those settled in the northern part, and the papyri do not furnish any conclusive evidence as to the changes which may have ensued from the days of Jeremiah to the time when the temple of Elephantine was destroyed.¹

In all such cases as these it is to be remembered that religious conceptions, ritual, moral, or ethical ideas, etc., do not necessarily advance hand-in-hand. Every one knows what is commonly associated with the cult of the Babylonian goddess Ishtar, few perhaps know that one of the most striking of ancient religious passages outside the Old Testament is addressed to her in her character as the goddess of war.² In Palestine itself it is now possible to institute direct comparison in the realm of religion, culture and thought in the fifteenth to the fourteenth century B.C., when the cuneiform tablets illustrate the literary expression of the age.³ From the purely diplomatic letters addressed to the divine Pharaoh it is possible to form some idea of the general character which contemporary religious literature could take, and the result when viewed together with the more private tablets found at Taanach is interesting. It is only on turning to the actual results of excavation at Gezer, Taanach, Megiddo and elsewhere that one vividly realizes the profound difference between the religion of that age and the sublime ethical monotheism which became Israel's glory. But the conditions—which were not a sudden

¹ I see no reason for the argument of Mr. Hollis that Pathros ("Land of the South") was in the Delta; such difficulties as the biblical texts contain must find another solution.

² L. W. King, *The Seven Tablets of Creation*, vol. i., App. v., pp. 222 sqq. (he describes it as "one of the finest Babylonian religious compositions that has yet been discovered").

growth but the development of earlier forms—continued to persist, and excavation shows independently how very slow and gradual was the subsequent development, and how inveterate were the underlying features.¹

Confronted with this development which recent archaeological research is enabling us to visualize, the problem of the precise religious condition of the Jewish community in Upper Egypt will depend very largely upon the circumstances of its origin. It would be fruitless, of course, to speculate upon the difference between Yahweh and Yahu. Whether it arose on religious grounds cannot be said; it is to be noticed (incidentally) that the papyri do not furnish any proper names compounded with El, and in this respect stand in contrast to the evidence from Nippur (see p. 498). The modern accepted pronunciation of the name Yahweh (also found on the Moabite stone of Mesha) is based upon a number of technical arguments and finds support in the form *Iabe* which is ascribed by Theodoret to the Samaritans and by Epiphanius to a Christian sect, and in the *'Iaové* or *'Iaoví* of Clement of Alexandria. *Yāhū* (for which Professor Ganneau would prefer *Yāhō*) is familiar enough from Hebrew theophorous names, and may be compared with the *Iao* of the Gnostics. Even Egyptian magical papyri furnish the spelling *Iabe* and in their *Iaōoune* one is tempted to see a conflation of the two forms *Iao* and *Iaoue* (cp. above).²

¹ The bearing of excavation in Palestine upon Old Testament religion can now be read in the admirable work by Father Hugues Vincent of the Frères Prêcheurs, Jerusalem, *Canaan d'après l'Exploration Récente* (for his remarks on the evidence see pp. 19 seq., 148 seq., 161, 183, 199 seq., 204, 345, 463 seq., with p. 461 and note 3).

² The evidence is from *Encyc. Bib.* col. 3321, n. 4. Through some curious misconceptions Colonel Conder (*Critics and the Law*, p. 33 seq.) appears to believe that the vocalization "Yahweh" is based upon the Hebrew vowel-points, which, as a matter of fact, are those of the ordinary word for "lord" (regularly read in place of the sacred name). It is as difficult to understand this treatment of the question as to allow his very

To sum up, the papyri afford welcome and quite unexpected information of the most interesting character ; their positive value is both great and lasting. But this is not to overlook the new problems they bring, and the new light in which older problems now appear. They distinctly forbid any far-reaching inferences, since they represent a new standpoint which is as interesting as it is suggestive. If the biblical writings in their final form represent what may be called the standpoint of Judah and Jerusalem, the possibility of other standpoints can never be ignored. We may be sure that Samaria, for example, looked on its history in another light than does our book of Kings ; and however closely the papyri bring us to the history of Nehemiah's time, the absence of that spirit which is associated with both Nehemiah and Ezra should scarcely cause surprise when the last chapters of the Book of Isaiah already show that there was divergence of opinion in regard to certain aspects of Judaism. It can be safely asserted that should any portion of the sacred writings of the Jews of Elephantine be brought to light, the internal phenomena in the Old Testament upon which there is a consensus of opinion will still continue to need an adequate explanation ; and should such writings differ from the Canon to the same extent as did the Nash papyrus from Egypt—that little fragment (probably second century A.D.) containing the Decalogue and the Shema—the biblical problems will only be enormously increased.

STANLEY A. COOK.

remarkable theory that the Moabite stone itself is nearer to Aramaic than Hebrew. His arguments here, even if valid, would equally prove that the Elephantine papyri were written in Hebrew. He is of course correct in regarding biblical research as a progressive study, but it is unfortunate that he should have devoted so little attention in his book to the evidence upon which critical views are based and to the archaeological and other facts by which they are supported.

THE PERSONALITY OF THE FOURTH EVANGELIST.

PROFESSOR BURKITT, in his recent book, *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, in speaking of the Dialogues between Jesus and the Jews in the Gospel of St. John, says of the form in which they are cast, that "the only possible explanation is that the work is not history, but something else cast in historical form." From this point of view, he goes on to say, "The question of the authorship of the Fourth Gospel is a matter of secondary importance. It is of the highest importance to ascertain the authorship and date of a chronicle, of a narrative of facts, because there the value of the work depends upon the nature of the traditions or sources to which the writer had access. But for a work of *philosophy* or *philosophical history* the qualifications required in the writer are mental, rather than local or temporal. We do not need to ask how near he stands to the events, but whether he sees them in their true proportion" (pp. 288-9).

We need not at present question the words I have placed in italics, whether they are or are meant to be an adequate definition of the contents of the Gospel, or whether they are sufficient to include the important element of Christian experience so prominent in the writing. My object is rather to emphasize a note in these words, characteristic of much of the present-day criticism of the Fourth Gospel, that, after all, it does not much matter

who wrote it, or what are his credentials. It would seem to be enough to secure the abiding spiritual value of it, that it adequately expresses the mind of the early Church about Jesus, and above all that it is but a dramatic rendering of the ruling ideas in the theology of St. Paul. Let me take a sentence almost at random out of Mr. Scott's eminent work on the Fourth Gospel. "The principle which Paul had fought for is accepted by John in its widest compass, and determines his whole theology. Jesus is the Logos, the light that lighteth every man. His appeal throughout is to "the world," of which he is the Light, the Life, the Saviour, and the True Bread. He has come to break down the old limitations, and to inaugurate a spiritual worship in which all may join alike" (p. 112). It is rapidly becoming a commonplace of advanced criticism¹ to regard St. Paul's as the creative and ruling mind behind the thought of the Gospel, and Professor Bacon has even gone so far as to suggest that "the beloved disciple" is none other than an idealized expression for the great Apostle to the Gentiles himself (*Hibbert Journal*, art. "Defence of the Fourth Gospel," Oct. 1907). A Pauline influence in the Gospel may be at once conceded, but is this shelving of the question of the personality of the Evangelist to do real justice to the nature of the Gospel itself? Can we determine its internal character, without bringing in any considerations of date and authorship at all? Are there not plain *suggestions* as to authorship, inextricably bound up with the material? The object of this paper is to point out, without in the first place dogmatizing as to who wrote it, that the whole work is pervaded by a great and original

¹ Similarly, Professor Bacon in the *Hibbert Journal* for October, p. 139: "The significance of the Fourth Gospel lies in its testimony to the growth and self-definition of the Gospel of Paul in the heart of the Church of the uncircumcision, before the harking back to Jerusalem."

personality, with a distinct consciousness of his own about Jesus Christ, and a living experience of the Risen Christ. That is, of course, sufficiently obvious, but it seems to me that we cannot adequately appreciate these lofty thoughts without having at the same time a conception and not merely a vague and shadowy notion of the thinker. The question of authorship is more than a merely academic one. It occupies a unique position. None of the other three claims to be written by the man whose name it bears, but the Fourth Gospel is issued with an explicit statement to that effect (xxi. 24). The statement is most significant, even although we must grant that the Appendix is by another hand. Moreover, its contents are vitally connected with the individuality of the author. As will be shown later, the very way in which his identity is studiously concealed shows that the writer is himself conscious that the Gospel contains a personal testimony, which he does not hesitate to present as objective, and, in the end, impersonal. A spirit of weariness has naturally crept over the minds of scholars with regard to the never-ending problem of authorship, but plain justice demands that we should not despair of taking up the writer's own challenge to be known and recognized. Here we have a narrative where individual experience is prominent. Why was it not possible for the author to incorporate his own testimony in the Gospel, without keeping himself in the background in such a way as really to attract attention? There must be some reason for this conduct other than a modesty which would, if it were genuine, really defeat its own end. We have strong reasons for wishing to know who it is that narrates events and discourses of Jesus so distinct in character from the Synoptics, and yet meant to occupy a place alongside these without contradiction; who it is that has so boldly mingled historic fact and ideal conceptions;

100 PERSONALITY OF THE FOURTH EVANGELIST

that has given to the Person of Christ a timeless, cosmic significance, and has represented our Lord in His acts and in His words as Himself justifying that impression and those claims. If, as is certain, the work is deeply influenced by developed theological conceptions and in part reflects the contemporary historical situation of the Christian Church at the time it was written, we desire to be assured that this writer was in a position not seriously to misrepresent the actual facts.

I. If we take the Gospel as it stands, we are met from time to time with references to an unknown disciple, an individual who is always mentioned periphrastically. In i. 35 it is said that "John stood and two of his disciples," and in v. 40, one of the two is named as Andrew, leaving the other still nameless. Similarly, reference is made in xiii. 23 to a disciple who was "leaning on Jesus' bosom," and "whom Jesus loved." In xviii. 15, in connexion with the story of Peter's denial, mention is made of "another disciple," who followed Jesus along with Peter, and was the means of his admission to the palace. We are further told that he was "known to the High Priest."¹ Again at the Cross, xix. 26, 27, 35, he is mentioned first as "the disciple whom Jesus loved," and again as "that disciple." In xx. 2, 3, 4, 8, we have "the other disciple whom Jesus loved," "that other disciple," "the other disciple," "that other disciple," all referring to the same individual. In the Appendix, xxi. 7, 20, 23, the expression is again used, and in v. 24 the nameless disciple is identified with the author of the Gospel. Even

¹ It is a question whether *γινώσκων* here means a friendly intimacy, or a blood relationship. Cf. Luke ii. 44, and xxiii. 49. It would be somewhat easier to explain the presence of the nameless disciple in the palace at such a juncture on the latter supposition. Blood is thicker than water, but there is no evidence that the lives of the disciples themselves were at the moment in real danger.

if we grant, as I think we must do, that the Appendix is by another hand, still the opinion of the writer must necessarily carry great weight, especially as it seems to be the obvious deduction from the language of the Gospel itself. It is therefore a striking fact, for our thesis, that it is impossible to estimate the value of the writing apart from the writer, when we find that his personality is thus obtruded both by himself and by another who feels himself gratified to speak as he does in xxi. 24. On the other hand, the way in which the author sedulously veils his identity, suppresses it throughout the greater part of the Gospel, and refers to himself only under circumstances where a reference cannot be escaped, is itself an indication that he was only too deeply aware of the personal and subjective element in his work.

We are met, however, at this point with the view of those critics who see in the figure of the Beloved Disciple an ideal figure, a type of the highest Christian faith.¹ How do they interpret xxi. 24? According to Professor Bacon Chapter xxi. is the work of a Redactor, who has also edited the Gospel, and he says categorically, "We refuse to accept the Redactor's opinion as to the authorship of the Gospel" (*Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1907). He firmly believes in the "sincerity of both the anonymous evangelist, and of his Editor in the appendix, however slight the qualifications of either for historical or literary criticism" (*ibid.*). Has then the Redactor made a grave and egregious mistake in regarding "the beloved disciple" not only as a real person, but also as the author, and the Apostle John himself? Let that leading question impress itself on our minds, in view of the fact that "Redactor" is held responsible for a very extensive working up of genuine Johannine material. It would appear that, in Professor Bacon's view, so *sincere*

¹ Professor Bacon's interpretation of the Ideal Figure will be found in the *EXPOSITOR*, Oct. 1907.

was he in his belief, which he shared with the Church of the second century, that he deliberately inserted, amongst his other extensive editorial work, *all* the more or less indirect references to the nameless disciple, including even xix. 35 ; i.e., all except "the three unequivocal entries of this figure upon the stage," viz., John xiii. 1-30, John xix. 25-27, and the references to the "disciple whom Jesus loved" in chapter xx.

In the first place, it may be pointed out that those who are still content to regard the beloved disciple as "a real person of flesh and blood" will find a very great deal in Professor Bacon's theory to comfort them. It is of very great value to have such an authority as he affirm that the author of the Appendix to the Gospel is sincerely and firmly convinced that not only is the Beloved Disciple a real person, but that he wrote the Gospel, at least in the form in which it came to Redactor's hands, and that he is no other than St. John himself ; and also to have it so clearly indicated that he disagrees with Redactor's opinion. When however two such authorities differ so widely in their interpretations of the same set of facts, who is to decide ? It is a great advantage to have the field of action so clearly delimited. I imagine that, from one or two expressions that Professor Bacon lets fall in the course of the two articles I have mentioned, he has no very great opinion, at least, of the historical and critical abilities of this Redactor. He speaks in one place of "his all too frequent maltreatment of his material." Apart from that, it is extremely helpful clearly to understand that the "type" theory, for which Scholten is ultimately responsible, involves a clear issue, uncomplicated as so many other Johannine questions are by matters of conjectural interpretation. The issue lies between a certain school of modern critics, and the most ancient piece of external evidence in connexion with the Gospel that we

possess, viz. xxi. 24. Between these two widely different interpretations of the same statement, have we any valid means of deciding ?

Certain general considerations may be adduced that are clearly unfavourable to the modern hypothesis. Prominent amongst these is the instinctive recoil we make from any critical theory that is largely based on a hypothesis of interpolation. To say that in all the instances where there occurs a reference to the nameless disciple except three,—those at the Supper, at the Cross, and at the Tomb,—the Redactor has interpolated, is merely a twisting of the facts as given us, to suit a previous hypothesis, and it is quite open for any one seriously to question whether such procedure satisfies the logical conditions of a valid argument. It is indeed startling to see the way in which this assumption of interpolation can be brought into agreement with most of the real facts, but it is also eminently desirable that the agency of interpolation in this case should be proved to exist at such an early stage ; in other words, is what Newton called a *vera causa*. Is it so easy to divide the seamless robe ? Nay, more, in one at least of the three “unequivocal entries” the interpretation of the text does *not* tally with the conception that the beloved disciple represents the highest type of Christian belief. In xx. 8 we read, “Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulchre, and he saw and believed,” and the succeeding verse, introduced by γὰρ, in its natural sense would imply that, just as the faith of the nameless disciple transcends the faith of Simon Peter, so there is a still higher type of faith, indicated in v. 9, that is independent of an actual vision of the empty Tomb and founded on prophetic Scriptures, that “has not seen, and yet has believed.” “For as yet, they knew not the Scripture, that He must rise again from the dead.”

Again, if this is "no disciple of flesh and blood," why does Simon Peter "beckon to him," and why is his place at the table so clearly defined? ¹ Grave doubt is expressed that, if this is meant to indicate a real person, John should ever allow the traitor to walk forth before his eyes. Does not this objection apply also to any theory that the Beloved Disciple is an ideal Christian? Is there no ethical significance in an ideal type? Would any writer dare to attribute what seems to be either indifference or cowardice even to an ideal figure? If any explanation is needed, surely it is that "that disciple," with his insight into the mind of Jesus so clearly expressed afterwards in the terrible words, "That thou doest, do quickly," saw and knew that Jesus wished Judas to go out unobserved.

II. We have said that a distinct Personality lies behind the writing, and I believe that according to xxi. 4, it is the personality of the writer himself. Let us test this hypothesis in two definite instances. Can we bring any other facts, gathered from the rest of the Gospel, to show (1) that "disciple whom Jesus loved" is an appropriate title for him; or that (2), when the supposed Redactor described him in one passage as "known to the High Priest"—even granting that this is an interpolation, which is very precarious reasoning—he has any grounds in the Gospel for these words.

1. To avoid any confusion of thought, let it be said at once that I am now proceeding on the supposition that the words "disciple whom Jesus loved" is a term applied by the Evangelist to himself. We may leave out of account at this stage the question whether the phrase implies an undue consciousness of superiority. Rather, it seems to

¹ The expression, "leaning on Jesus' bosom, or "lying on Jesus' breast," need not be interpreted in a sentimental and symbolical sense. It would naturally describe the position of one who lay at the meal beside the Lord.

me, that any evangelist who so confidently all through the Gospel claims to interpret the inmost thoughts of Jesus (cf. xi. 33, 13, 21, etc., and the whole form of discourse and dialogue into which the words of the Lord are thrown) must of necessity produce his credentials. If, for other reasons, he desires to remain anonymous, it is difficult to see what nobler apology he could have devised for himself than just this phrase, "disciple whom Jesus loved." Moreover, it must be carefully noted that the expression is almost never used except where some such tacit explanation is needed. Why do they all refer to him at the supper? Why does he occupy a place next to Jesus? Why does Jesus entrust to him the care of His mother? Moreover, it is a singularly appropriate title for one who is so clearly allowing his personal point of view to pervade his narrative, and to interpret events and sayings of the earthly ministry in the light of the contemporary situation of the Church of Christ. For example, the valedictory discourses have no doubt taken the continuous form that they now bear, through the welding¹ together in the consciousness of the writer of recollections of the closing days with the burning desire to make plain to the early Church that her present condition of anxiety and distress was anticipated with solicitous forethought in the prophetic words of the Saviour.

At first sight, this view of the apologetic meaning of the phrase would seem to be contradicted by the fact that elsewhere he so studiously veils his identity. Why does he do so? It is, I think, quite permissible to see in xxi. 24 an indication that it was felt necessary, even at that early date at which the Appendix was written,¹ to authenticate the position that the Apostle John made himself responsible for the statements contained in the Gospel. This would not

¹ It must be borne in mind that we have no trace of a gospel *without* the appendix.

necessarily be because there was doubt as to the Johannine authorship, but, in accord with the whole tone of criticism adopted towards the Fourth Gospel in the second century, because the Gospel differs so much in character, subject and content from the Synoptics, which already held the ground as authorities for the Life and Teaching of our Lord. If that be a true description of the situation at the time that the Gospel was published, we may get a clue to this sedulous concealment of the name. The writer would labour under a deep sense of responsibility in thus presenting to the Church a view of Christ's Person and Work so different from the Synoptics ; and he would naturally take the wisest way of setting forth his Gospel as not merely an account that was dependent on the testimony of one individual. His object would really be to set it forth as a record of universal Christian experience, true to the mind and tradition of the Christian Church, to the needs of men, and to the facts of the Life and Sayings of Jesus. Perhaps this explains why he once or twice uses " we," and so integral a part of this universal and yet personal Christian experience is the Risen Lord Himself, speaking through His Spirit, that once in the words of our Lord Himself the " we " occurs. " We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen, and ye receive not our witness " (iii. 11). The purpose of the Gospel is to treat the facts of the Life and Teaching of Jesus in such a way as to produce faith in the hearts of those who had not been eyewitnesses, and were therefore all the more inclined to regard their position in relation to the bodily facts as a loss and a hindrance to faith. So far from this, the climax of faith is, not to have seen, and yet to believe (xx. 29). There would no doubt be men like Thomas in the early Church, easily cast down, and satisfied only by the bodily presence of Christ, to whom all else was unreal. No personal assurance was sufficient to convince

them. The Evangelist, therefore, veiled his identity, and emphasized the point of view of Universal Christian experience, and the tradition for which he is responsible. This also is no doubt the meaning of the impersonal reference in xx. 31: "*These things are written* that ye might believe that Jesus is the "Christ."

A very interesting glimpse into the mind of the writer in this connexion is obtained in the case of the passage xix. 35-37. Here the Evangelist is compelled to isolate his own personality from the Church in whose name he speaks. He alone of that group is present at the Cross. In this case he has to find, in accordance with his principle, some means of authenticating his testimony. It is interesting to note how this is done, and the character of the Gospel, as not dependent on a single testimony alone, vindicated. A threefold corroboration is adduced. (a) His witness is true (*ἀληθινός*), i.e. confirmed by the Spirit of Truth, which according to the Evangelist must be an indispensable part of the equipment for writing such a Gospel ("Ye know Him; for He dwelleth with you and shall be in you. . . . The Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you," xiv. 17-26). (b) Reference is made to One who "knoweth that He saith true." I take *ἐκεῖνος* to denote Christ Himself. (c) The Scriptures are adduced as a witness, i.e. the witness of God Himself (vv. 36, 37). "A bone of Him shall not be broken": "They shall look on Him whom they pierced." Here the emphasis is not laid on the fact of the flow of blood and water from the pierced side, but on *the spiritual interpretation* to be put on it. This interpretation he regarded as of peculiar value to his readers, and some form of the Doherty heresy is no doubt aimed at. At all events, the writer's corroboration of what is by a necessity

of the case an individual testimony affords some very suggestive thought as to his behaviour in so concealing his name throughout the rest of the Gospel. A deep significance attaches to this attitude of mind and heart, which all tends to confirm the idea, that in the consciousness of the Fourth Evangelist himself his own personality is inseparably bound up with his work.

One word more may be added to this attempt to explicate the meaning in the consciousness of this Evangelist of the phrase, "disciple whom Jesus loved." It will be a word laden with the gravest significance for the religious value of the Fourth Gospel, if we are disposed to acquiesce, as I think we must, in the position that the individuality of the writer colours deeply not only the narrative, but also the discourses of our Lord. If this Evangelist is so constantly aware as he seems to be, not only that the Risen Christ is speaking to his listening ear, but that the wonderful love He bore him on earth has only grown in wonder and magnificence in the Christian experience that pervades and impels his whole work, what but a most careful and accurate and reverential attitude would we expect him to take towards the Life and words of his Lord?

Since much that at the first, in deed and word,
Lay simply and sufficiently exposed,
Had grown (or else my soul was grown to match,
Fed through such years, familiar with such light,
Guarded and guided still to see and speak)
Of new significance and fresh result;
What first were guessed as points, I now knew stars
And named them in the Gospel I have writ.

If Browning's be a true account of his mental and spiritual process, and that mutual Love, from being a "point" has become a "star," can we conceive that one who could also say, like St. Paul, "Nevertheless, not I, but Christ that liveth in me," would take unwarrantable liberties with the

self-consciousness of Jesus as manifested in His life on earth? Would he import into His exposition of the Mind and Sayings of Jesus material derived from his own reflection, without the most careful and serious solicitude and the surest guarantee that he did not misrepresent the mind of the Master Himself? I am convinced that the words "the disciple whom Jesus loved" dare not be trifled with, but are pregnant with profoundest significance for the spiritual and abiding value of the Fourth Gospel.

2. We may now turn to another periphrastic form in which the Evangelist is referred to. I mean the words in xviii. 16, "that other disciple, which was known unto the high priest." Is there any sign in the Gospel itself that this description is an appropriate one? I think there are several. Professor Sanday, in his work *The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*, has drawn attention to the knowledge of sects and parties displayed by the writer (pp. 123 ff.). Nothing is more striking in the Gospel than the intimate acquaintance that is displayed with the ecclesiastical situation and feeling of the time. In i. 19 ff. a deputation is sent to the Baptist from the ecclesiastical authorities in Jerusalem consisting of priests and their attendant Levites, and the Evangelist breaks the narrative of the deputation to insert the remark, evidently meant to explain the question that follows, that the deputation included some Pharisees. Their inquiry in i. 24 betrays an interest in ritual and in the orderly observance of the Law which is characteristic of that party, as distinct from the Sadducees. "Why baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?" (i. 25). The Sadducees seem to have applied rationalist and moderate principles to the old religion, and were distinguished by dogmatic differences not only regarding the rule of faith, but in connexion with such questions as the life after death, and the question of freewill

and predestination (Edersheim, *Life and Times*, i. pp. 310-324). It can scarcely be without meaning that the Evangelist, who knew that Caiaphas was a Sadducee, and that he might be supposed to share their beliefs about predestination, should represent him, with an ironical touch, as the unconscious prophet and instrument of the death of Christ. "This he spake not of himself" (xi. 51-52). Again, he does not speak of Pharisees and Sadducees, but of Chief Priests and Pharisees, showing that he is acquainted with the fact that the Sadducees held the offices in the time of Christ. The whole passage xi. 47-83 is full of ecclesiastical knowledge. The discussion there in the Sanhedrin is occasioned by the influence on the people of the raising of Lazarus, and we can clearly distinguish the attitude of the two parties. The Pharisees are represented as in touch with the people, and they are afraid lest a tumult should arise, and thereby both their ecclesiastical influence (τόπος) and the national existence be destroyed by Rome. The attitude of the two parties towards the "popular" movement is very clearly marked. The reply of Caiaphas to the fears expressed by the Pharisaic party is quite characteristic of the haughty aristocrat. "Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." The passage vii. 45-52 displays a similar knowledge of the close relationship existing between Pharisees and people. (Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* XIII. x. 6.) "Are ye also deceived? Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on Him? But this people, who knoweth not the law, are cursed" (vv. 47-49). Again, after the triumphal entry, it is the Pharisees who seem to have been filled with dismay at their loss of influence with the people and at the popularity of Jesus. "The Pharisees therefore said among themselves, Perceive ye how ye prevail no-

thing? Behold, the world is gone after Him" (xii. 19). It is the ruling Sadducean party who take the initiative in plotting the death of Lazarus. "The chief priests consulted that they might put Lazarus also to death" (xii. 10). Again, it is the Fourth Evangelist who tells us of the informal trial before Annas, who, though still wielding much power, had been deposed in favour of his son-in-law, Caiaphas (xviii. 12-24; cf. Schürer, *HJP*, II. i. 195 ff.; art. "Annas" in Hastings' *DCG*).

These indications of a somewhat intimate acquaintance with the trend of opinion in ecclesiastical circles are in complete correspondence with the statement in xviii. 15 about the disciple "who was known to the high priest." They also give additional corroboration to the view that the phrase is an indirect reference by the Evangelist to himself.

III. Another term by which the writer may be regarded as referring to himself is "witness." This is the description of his work that is employed by the unknown Author of chapter xxi.: "This is the disciple which witnesseth of these things, and wrote these things; and we know that his witness is true" (v. 24). It will be noted that if the order of the words has any significance, "testimony" or "witnessing" is regarded as the more prominent feature in the book, and one that determines the character of the "writing" and its interpretation. What is the precise signification of this word "witness" as applied to the Evangelist? In what sense does he apply the name to himself?

The word is of extreme importance in connexion with the question of the historicity of the Gospel, which will be dealt with in a subsequent article. In the meantime, for our present purpose of determining the extent to which the personality of the writer pervades and colours his writing, we may take the definition of the term that is

contained in the First Epistle. Surely even those critics who to-day are disposed to deny common authorship between the Epistles and the Gospel will not feel that I am going beyond the facts regarded even by them as legitimate, when I quote the passages in the First Epistle that speak of witnessing, and seek to apply their meaning to the word used in the Gospel.

“That which was from the beginning, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld and our hands handled, concerning the word of life (and the life was manifested, and we have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us); that which we have seen and heard, declare we unto you also, that ye also may have fellowship with us: yea, and our fellowship is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ: and these things we write that your joy may be fulfilled” (1 John i. 1-4).

“And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth. . . . If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for the witness of God is this, that He hath borne witness concerning His Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in him: he that believeth not God, hath made Him a liar: because he hath not believed. . . . And the witness is this, that God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath the life; he that hath not the Son of God, hath not the life” (v. 6b, 9-12).

It is obvious that in these passages the term “witness.” is applied to one who has received the Holy Spirit. Making use of a certain paucity of terms which is characteristic both in the Epistle and in the Gospel, the writer speaks in the same sentence of “the witness of men” and of “the witness of God,” and again of “the Spirit that beareth witness.” For the purpose of the writer’s exposition, these

three are distinguished, but the unity that will contain them all is just the total experience of one who is himself filled with the Spirit, and feels himself in touch with the living Christ, the Son of God, and possesses therefore all the qualifications for a "witness." It is true that it is the witness of "a man" or of "men," but it is not therefore invalid ; for the witness of God is behind the experience. The witness of God *is greater* ; for the witness of God is this, that "He hath borne witness concerning His Son." Once again, as in the Gospel, the consciousness is betrayed that the message comes by the prophetic testimony of an individual, and once again there is the very evident desire to claim for it that it is nevertheless objective, and not the mere product of a single unaided human understanding and experience. Does not the personality of the writer here obtrude itself in the same conscious fashion as in the Gospel ?

Turning now to the Gospel, we find a clearly expressed conviction that the gift of the Spirit of Truth must be part of the equipment of one who pens such a narrative as this. It is represented as part of the *apostolic* equipment. "And I will pray the Father, and He shall give you another Advocate to be with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth ; which the world cannot receive, for the world neither sees Him nor knows Him ; but ye know Him, because He remains with you and is in you " (xiv. 17). "When the Advocate is come . . . He shall testify of me : and ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning " (xv. 26, 27). In the latter words, the correspondence is obvious with the thought of ocular testimony in the opening verse of the Epistle.

At this point, I would beg leave to make what is undoubtedly a large assumption in view of present-day criticism of the Gospel, that the writer desires to be regarded as an eyewitness. Personally, I would have no hesitation,

in spite of all that has been written and said, in believing that he is an eyewitness. At the same time, this conservative position must not be regarded as prejudicing the position I would seek still further to establish, that the Evangelist, sometimes sub-consciously, lays bare for us and impresses on his narrative his own particular type of personality and caste of mind in many of his utterances. Does he afford us any indication here and there of such a psychological condition induced by the work of the Spirit in his heart, as might be described in modern philosophical language? I think he does. Apart from the much larger question of the symbolism of the Gospel, he displays what might be called the "symbolic" mind, a mind that is especially open to any suggestion of spiritual truth conveyed by the actual facts (e.g. ii. 11, 17). The miracles are not only "actualities" (*ἔργα*), but they are also signs (*σημεία*). Siloam is "sent," the sending forth of the waters being typical, perhaps, of the Christ sent from God (ix. 7). Judas goes out of the light of the upper room, to do his dark deed, "into the night" (xiii. 30). "It was winter" at the feast of the Dedication (x. 22), symbolizing the storm of hatred and the chill of indifference that met the warmth of love in the breast of that infinitely lonely Figure, walking in Solomon's Porch. The use made of the sign in xix. 35 is also typical of this attitude of mind. These instances indicate one less recognized direction in which the Evangelist himself displays how the "witness" of the Spirit of Truth made itself felt in the attitude that he regarded it as legitimate to take with regard to the actual facts. He feels himself quite justified in narrating, as part of the Truth, not only the bare facts, but the spiritual suggestions they awakened in his mind, sometimes after a long lapse of years.

IV. Any consideration of this great question would not be complete without some clear indication of the way in

which it bears on the question of the apostolic authorship. I am well aware of the apparent rashness of such a proceeding as to deal with the question of the apostolic authorship in a few sentences at the end of an article.¹ Yet one may be allowed boldly to ask the question whether all that has been said and written against the apostolic authorship has really rendered it so impossible, or even unlikely, that the Gospel was written by the son of Zebedee. The internal evidence has long been regarded as decisive for or against the apostolic authorship, but now, one of the most serious difficulties in the way is, strangely enough, a matter that is really part of the external evidence, viz., the statement attributed to Papias, on the authority of the Chronicle of Philip of Side, that St. John died early as a martyr.² At present however we are only concerned with the evidence of the Gospel itself. Perhaps enough has been said to show that the matter of authorship cannot be lightly dismissed, if we are to be true to the manner of the Gospel itself, and to the consciousness of the Evangelist. If that be so, did St. John write it? It seems to me that there is no question of New Testament criticism where the need is more imperative to rid ourselves of prejudice than the question of the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel. Can it have been written by a fisherman of Galilee? The retort to that is, "What do you mean by a fisherman of Galilee? Do you mean a man so uneducated that he could not possibly have written a work that contains such depth of thought and such evident skill in the massing of the material?" One would think that in the minds of certain critics there still lurks a completely mistaken conception of the connexion be-

¹ For a fuller consideration of the question of Authorship see the article on the Gospel of John (Part I.) in Hastings' *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*. Vol. I.

² The most recent discussion of this question will be found in Professor Burkitt's *Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 252 ff.

tween letters and handicraft in the apostolic days. Peter and John are described in Acts iv. 13 as unlearned and ignorant men (*ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται*). *ἰδιώτης* marks a caste distinction, in opposition to the learned or academic classes. The use of the vernacular tongue by the apostles would be sufficient to suggest the expression. The Pharisaic objection is, as Delitzsch reminds us, a decline from the traditional honourable connexion between the Rabbi and the handworker (*Jewish Artisan Life*, p. 54). On the other hand, is it not also possible that in their estimate of the philosophic character of the Gospel, critics may have been *too much* prepossessed by the indications that are given in the Gospel of acquaintance with philosophic systems, and the influence of a Greek atmosphere? Could a Greek atmosphere of thought not be influential outside academic circles? That is matter for much wider discussion than is possible here. It may, however, be added that a similar difficulty arises, in a somewhat accentuated form, when it is sought to ascribe the main form and composition of the Gospel to a Redactor as Professor Bacon does, who was stupid enough and unimaginative enough to regard the "disciple whom Jesus loved" as a real person, and that individual the Apostle John. Is this not a libel at least on the intellectual ability of the dead?

In conclusion, it may be said that if the apostolic authorship is denied on such grounds as those mentioned above, or on the ground that the Gospel is too able a production to proceed from one of the twelve, it may fairly be asked whether our Lord, in making choice of His immediate followers, would leave out of account altogether the element of the natural ability they might display, or the question of social position. Zebedee owned his own fishing-vessel, and the presumptuous request of the mother of Zebedee's sons betrays a very strong sense of their capabilities, and a "some-

what overweening sense" of social position. Moreover, we too must take knowledge that the Apostle had been with Jesus, and it would not be easy to estimate, in addition to the spiritual training, the purely educative influence of companionship with Jesus of Nazareth. He who, with such insight and, as I think, emotion,¹ leads us into the spiritual incapacity of Nicodemus must have been himself "born again" into a new world, and there have gained a new outlook.

R. H. STRACHAN.

¹ Not stupidity, nor wilful obtuseness, but a profound emotion, seems to breathe in the question of Nicodemus, "How can a man be born when he is old?" (iii. 4).

ECCLESIASTES AND ECCLESIASTICUS.

It has at times been suggested that the compilers of the Canon of the Old Testament made a mistake in including the work which bears the name Koheleth (Ecclesiastes), and would have done better to include that which is ascribed to Ben-Sira (Ecclesiasticus). Such a view rests on a mistaken notion of the literary position of the two books. Ben-Sira emphatically repudiates all claim to originality, Koheleth is equally emphatic in asserting his. The one claims to have dug a canal and filled it with Bible water, which indeed rushed in more copiously than he had foreseen; the other claims to have searched out aphorisms, and to have weighed and corrected them with the utmost care. His operations combined those of miner and minter: of one who searches for the precious metal, and one who coins it in pieces that are clearly inscribed and scrupulously accurate in weight. If his work had to be described in a simile taken from water, he would have called himself a water-finder or digger of wells.

The question, then, that suggests itself is whether among the books on which Ben-Sira drew Koheleth had a place. And to this, in the present writer's opinion, there can only be one answer. The author of Ecclesiasticus not only borrows from Ecclesiastes as frequently as from other Biblical books, but assumes the infallible truth of what he finds there, whether it be consistent or inconsistent with what is found elsewhere in his Canon. Provided he can give Scriptural authority for his aphorisms, he is satisfied that they are unobjectionable. Hence in xiv. 16 he advises the enjoyment of life on the ground that there is no enjoyment to be had in the next world—a sentiment so objectionable to the moralist that the Syriac translator alters it;

but his defence would be that he is merely paraphrasing Ecclesiastes ix. 10. If his paraphrases be compared with the parallel texts in Ecclesiastes, it will be found that those texts have by his Procrustean method been accommodated to his nine-syllable rhythm. So whereas Koheleth says of nature "nothing can be put to it, nor anything taken from it" (iii. 14), Ben-Sira paraphrases this "there is not to take away nor to add" (xviii. 5),¹ where the inversion and omission produce the rhythmical effect required. The process may be illustrated by most verses of Ecclesiasticus as they appear in the only genuine records of them which we possess—the Greek and Syriac versions. Thus in the immediate neighbourhood xvii. 22—"The Most High who shall praise in Hades, instead of persons living and giving thanks?"²—a conflation of Psalm vi. 5, "In Hades who shall give thee thanks?" with Isaiah xxxviii. 19, "The living, the living, he shall praise thee," and an expression derived from Ezra x. 11.

From these observations we learn one fact of importance—that whatever may be the date of Ecclesiastes, he is at the least pre-Maccabaeen. More than that—i.e. at what point of the Persian or Alexandrine period he is to be placed—will probably never be known. Such historical allusions as he introduces are of so vague a character and so carefully veiled that without a contemporary commentary they cannot be interpreted. Cases of kings who have been raised to the throne out of confinement and at an age when they were no longer able to take care of themselves occur in the histories of many nations: cities delivered from siege by the ingenuity of some obscure person, afterwards forgotten, are to be found, we fancy, in records

¹ Heb. (doubtless) אין לגרוע ולא להוסיף.

² Heb. לעליון מי יודה בשאול תחת חיים ונותנים תודה. The division of a word between the clauses is common.

of different ages. If the description of the king Koheleth's luxury were not at the least pre-Maccabaeian, we might suppose it to be taken from the annals of Khumârûyah, son of Ahmad ibn Tûlûn, who indulged himself in a very similar way at his capital Katâ'i' in Egypt towards the close of the ninth century A.D.

Sir Henry Howorth has suggested that several of the later books of the Old Testament were originally written in Aramaic, and if this theory were made to include Ecclesiastes, some arguments could be found in its favour. The chief of these would be the etymology of the word for *man* in vi. 10, where it is said to imply "inability to contend with one that is stronger." The Hebrew *âdhâm* does not suggest this, but the Aramaic (*nâshâ* or *enâsh*) suggests it without any manipulation. The Aramaic dictionaries (rightly or wrongly) connect it with a root signifying "to be weak, powerless."¹ One or two of the most violent Aramaisms might then be accounted for on the supposition that the translator was not quite sure how his original should be rendered, and so retained the actual words. On the other hand, there is a "curious felicity" about many of the aphorisms which renders the hypothesis of translation unsatisfactory, and several of the idioms appear to indicate the influence of an Indo-Germanic rather than of another Semitic language. Perhaps, then, the Aramaic tendencies will be sufficiently accounted for by the hypothesis that the author *thought* in that language, though he wrote in another.

To return, however, to a comparison between the two books, Koheleth is a writer whose studies and observations have resulted in a system which he fearlessly works out, only tempered by occasional concessions to popular piety, which, supposing that they are not the corrections of a

¹ Levy, iii. 446, "Schwach, Kraftlos sein": Kohut, v. 391, similarly.

reader, but slightly affect the result. The fearlessness, however, appears to be confined to the thought. The system is published as the soliloquy of a *dead man*, whose life is past (vii. 15, cf. ix. 9), and this form may have been suggested by the epitaphs of kings, such as that in which Eshmunazar of Sidon recounts his acts, and deplores his untimely death. The character of king is chosen because of the irresponsibility of that post (viii. 3, 4), which enables its holder to try any experiment, and because from its altitude the best view of the world can be obtained. But since the evils of the world are the chief subject of meditation, and a king has it in his power to remedy at least some of these, the rôle is soon abandoned for that of preacher: the king of the first chapter becomes in the epilogue a sage who taught the people knowledge.

If Ben-Sira's rôle be compared with this, it will be found to be a humble one, for he neither conceals his name, nor makes any pretension to independent research, nor cares for any harmony between his statements, provided that there is authority for them somewhere in the Canon. Koheleth is positive that with death men's interest in the affairs which busy those above ground is over for ever (ix. 6). Their consciousness, or personality, is terminated (ibid. 5): the humblest form of life is therefore preferable to the noblest form of death (ibid. 4). This gives Ben-Sira his justification for the assertion quoted above, and for the advice to the mourner not to overdo his grief, because the dead will not profit, and the mourner only lose thereby (Ecclus. xxxviii. 21). "Make no mistake, there is no return." But the Old Testament has other doctrines besides these, and they can be verified also. "We, too, shall return to life" when Elijah comes (xlviii. 11), because that is implied in Malachi iii. 24 (iv. 6). The wicked are to be punished with fire and worm (vii. 17), because there is

Isaiah's authority for that assertion (lxvi. 24). There is no occasion to reconcile these various theories, which are all true because there is Biblical authority for them.

The eternity of the world is a doctrine which at a later time was considered to be a mainstay of atheism, and is shown to be such by Kant in his wonderful chapter on the interest of the pure reason in the strife of the Antinomies (ed. Hartenstein, iii. 330). It is a pillar in the system of Koheleth, who insists upon it in the most positive style. The sum of which nature consists is invariable, admitting neither of addition nor subtraction: any assertion of the appearance of a new element is to be rejected without hesitation as a contemptible error. Accumulations, whether of wealth or of experience, are futile; because there is no continuity in such accumulations, which are dissipated by the succeeding generation. A pious writer might think a little before embracing such a doctrine, but Ben-Sira is quite satisfied with the authority of Koheleth, and so states (xlii. 21) that the marvels of God's wisdom are "before eternity and unto eternity, without addition or subtraction: nor did He (God) need any counsellor"—the last statement being on the authority of Isaiah xl. 13, 14. Yet the theory of Genesis that the world is, comparatively speaking, modern, and that of Isaiah that a new era is at hand, and to be expected speedily (lx. 22) are certainly not rejected by Ben-Sira.¹ What Koheleth thought of the former is not clear: it is evident what he thought of the latter.

A remarkable part of Koheleth's system lies in the influence which he ascribes to *Time*, a doctrine which might have led the author into the fancies of astrology, though there is no evidence of its having done so. Acts in them-

¹ Compare xxxiii. 6, "Renew signs and change wonders," חֲדָשׁ אֶת הַמִּלְאוֹת וְשַׁנֵּה נִסֵּי אֱלֹהִים, where the metre and sense show that "repeat wonders" was meant.

selves are indifferent—this he illustrates by twice seven examples of contrary acts. Their value is derived from the time at which they are done : it is in knowing the right time that the wise man differs from the fool—to a certain extent ; for even the wise man is often helpless when the time is against him. Whether the term by which Epicureans and atheists are known in Arabic—*duhris*, “time-worshippers”—has anything to do with the philosophy of Koheleth, is not clear ; but the term would suit the follower of some of his views. Owing to time, the ordinary laws of cause and effect cease to work (ix. 11) ; the best runner loses the race, and the best fighter is defeated in battle. Interpreted as death, which is its result, it sweeps away all distinctions (ii. 15).

Of course, this doctrine is equivalent to denying the moral government of the world, and Koheleth has little hesitation about doing that, and even charges the ruler of the world with making mistakes (x. 5), though he admits the case to be complicated. Punishment may, indeed is even likely to, overtake ill-doing, but it cannot be counted upon to do so in reasonable time (vii. 17, and viii. 11). If men are swept away, it is because time is bringing on a catastrophe, not because their operations are unusual : like fish they are carrying on their ordinary pursuit of swimming when they find themselves in the net. If they knew their time, possibly they could avoid destruction, as the fish might conceivably, just as in the story in Pilpay’s fables.

Ben-Sira’s standpoint, so far as he had one definitely, would doubtless have been opposed to these doctrines, for a book which recommends the study of wisdom from beginning to end, assumes that such study is efficacious. Nevertheless many of the aphorisms in which the views of Koheleth are conveyed are introduced into Ben-Sira’s

paraphrase. "He hath made everything fair in its time" (Eccles. ii. 11) reappears (Ecclus. xxxix. 34) in the form "It cannot be said this is worse than that, for everything will approve itself in its time." This applies in Ben-Sira's context to those forces of nature which are usually associated with evil—fire, hail, wild beasts, etc.: they are not (as might be supposed) worse than other things, because there is a time when they are wanted, i.e. when the wicked are to be punished. It appears, however, that the reference in Ecclesiastes (whose author would scarcely have accepted this doctrine) is not to objects, but to feelings and operations, since he adds that God "has put the world in their heart," i.e. put into man's consciousness all the forces or qualities of which he sees evidence outside him. The comment of the excellent Arabic writer Jâhîz on this notion of man as the microcosm seems particularly luminous: "Man has been called the microcosm because all the forms that are to be found in the great world are to be found in him. He has the five senses and the five objects of sense: he eats both flesh and grain, uniting the habits of carnivorous and graminivorous animals. He unites the leaping of the camel, the springing of the lion, the treachery of the wolf, the cunning of the fox, the cowardice of the house-martin, the spider's power of construction, the cock's liberality, the dog's tameness, the dove's home-instinct. . . . A further reason for calling him the microcosm is that he forms everything with his hands and mimics every sound that he hears. Another reason is that his members are apportioned to the twelve constellations and the seven planets, and his four humours correspond with the four elements. He embodies all the parts, elements and characteristics that are to be found in the great world" (*Treatise on Animals*, i. 99, 100).

Another doctrine which Kant in the passage quoted declares to be subversive of religion is that of fatalism or (its equivalent) determinism. This is, of course, adopted by Koheleth, who (ix. 7) advises men to eat their bread and drink their wine in comfort, because God has already approved their actions or what is to happen to them: it is the part of a "fool" to repine (vii. 9) or to be alarmed. The later writer accepts the conclusions of the earlier, without apparently adopting their philosophic basis. Care and vexation are to be avoided (xxx. 21-24) not because of their uselessness when man is confronted with the decrees of fate, but because they are bad for the constitution and likely to shorten life. Probably, however, the counsels of Koheleth would have been urged as the justification of the decidedly hedonistic precepts in Ecclesiasticus xxxiv. 28-xxxv. 6.

Any further investigation on these lines could only confirm the view which has been reached of the relation between the two authors—the bold and original thinker, and the paraphraser of texts taken from a sacred book. In the case of Ecclesiastes it is impossible to say whether we have to do with an Israelite or not: Ben-Sira leaves the reader in no doubt about his race. If the former got anything from the Greeks, it can only have been stimulation to original reflexion: of the ordinary commonplaces which foreigners derive from Greek sources, such as the four cardinal virtues or the four elements, his work contains no trace, nor can acquaintance on his part with any Greek author be clearly pointed out, as can be done in the case of Ecclesiasticus. The aphorisms which he publishes are his own: and he claims for them two qualities—that like nails driven home they stick in the memory, and that like goads they force the sluggish mind to move.

Most of the aphorisms certainly possess these qualities.

We may terminate this article by considering one with what seems to be Ben-Sira's comment upon it. Chapter iv. ends with a verse which may be rendered "Walk carefully as thou goest to the house of God, and one that is ready to hear is better than fools offering sacrifice: for they know not to do evil." The subject is continued in chapter v., where hasty, ill-considered and verbose prayer is condemned on the ground that "God is in heaven, and thou art on earth." These verses seem to be in the first place the source of Ecclesiasticus vii. 14, where the repetition of a word in prayer is forbidden. But it is likely also that they are the source of xxviii. 2, where it is prescribed that prayer should be preceded by forgiveness of injuries: the author interpreting the words "one that is ready to hear" as "one that is ready to hear the prayers which are addressed to himself." The sacrifice, then, of revenge will be a better thing than can be offered by the fool, who being unable to do evil cannot efficiently gratify it. For the wise man, through knowing the time (viii. 5), could do mischief if he liked: the fool's efforts would be futile. It seems likely that Ben-Sira hit the author's thought correctly, since the other explanations of this passage are quite unsatisfactory.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

*DR. GREGORY ON THE CANON AND TEXT OF
THE NEW TESTAMENT.*¹

THE present treatise contains the results of a life-long devotion to the study of the text of the New Testament and to the associated problem of the Canon ; it gathers up in a connected form what Dr. Gregory has been accumulating from personal researches in all the great libraries of Europe and of the East ; probably there is no one now living who has spent so much time in the direct examination of the manuscripts of the New Testament, and in the increase of our knowledge of them, both as to the places where they lie, and as to their contents : and for that reason, if for no other, the book is sure to become one of the standards of reference in the library of a Biblical student.

Tischendorf, whose mantle Dr. Gregory wears, died with his work unfinished on December 7, 1874 ; the Prolegomena to the eighth edition of his New Testament were left to his successors to write ; ten years after Tischendorf's death the first part of the Prolegomena appeared, and much of the information that was there contained will be found translated in the present volume, sometimes, as we shall see, without sufficient care to bring the treatment of the subject from the position it occupied in 1884 to that which it ought to occupy in 1907. For the progress that has been made in recent years both with the study of the Text and of the Canon is not slight, and although many famous workers in the field have been removed, their places have been occupied by an increasing number of explorers, some of whom seem likely to rank with the greatest names in the roll of New Testament scholarship.

The book before us is written in English of a type that

¹ Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark, 1907.

is unpleasing and often obscure : Dr. Gregory's long residence in Germany has affected his English ; his American origin shows itself, also, in many turns of speech which are not exactly Victorian English, and certainly cannot always be justified as Elizabethan. But it is the obscurity that is the worst feature of the style of the book : often a sentence has to be read several times over before one can tell what the writer means, and sometimes the fog is impenetrable. For instance, what is the meaning of such sentences as these ?—

P. 83. "He is one of the organizers of the renewal of the Old Testament, and of the law in the old Catholic Church that is beginning to knit together."

Or p. 84. "For those Christians, little as they overcast the whole sphere to reach such a conclusion, the new form of Christianity was not one of the retrograde steps."

Or p. 94. "The thought that Justin did not know our Gospels, but used apocryphal ones, finds a very good blocking-off in a single passage."

And what kind of English is contained in the following sentences ?

P. 122 (he is speaking of Hegesippus). "A certain ripeness of experience might be looked for from a man who set out to take a general account of stock in the Christian Church."

Or p. 154. "Irenaeus has done well by us."

Or p. 234. "Still further is to be observed, that the happy-go-luckiness with which, the reckless way in which we have seen that the writers of the early literature, which we have had to examine, etc."

P. 278. "He quotes Jude four times close together, and that fourteen verses out of Jude's twenty-five."

P. 287. "This excited word of Augustine's was all in all a frivolous word."

P. 322. "Such times of reverse served to sieve out the nominal Christians from the real Christians."

P. 355. "North of Kaisarie, in Cappadocia that was."

P. 354. "[Purple MSS.] were not practical, but they cost a great deal."

P. 402. "In the 'Nine-mile' Monastery, that far from Alexandria."

P. 404. "The two great translations have been favoured by fortune, at least from the point of view of textual criticism, so little from other points of view as their experiences could be called desirable."

P. 410. "The fact that it does not contain the three heavenly witnesses (1 John v. 7, 8), is the more interesting in connection with its Spanish allures."

P. 425. "All such tasks intercalate."

P. 477. "Given witnesses contain forms that certainly are old, and that do not agree with the spelling of the Attic National Academy."

And what is one to make of this :

P. 74. "A pupil of John, known to Irenaeus, at Rome to discuss with the Bishop Anicetus the Easter question, proclaimed by his Church at his death."

One feels like saying after reading that sentence, "Now, sir! construe!"

Very often the writer goes astray in the desire to be popular ; he coins new words that are misleading to scholars as well as to the non-experts. For example, what will the average man make of this statement about the Codex Zacynthius (p. 361), "It is the oldest manuscript with a *chain*" ? will he not rub his eyes several times, as one expert admits that he did, before he finds out that the writer means that the text is accompanied by a *catena* ? Perhaps the worst instance of this new coinage is when he undertakes to replace the unsatisfactory nomenclature of Dr. Hort, who divides the MSS. of the New Testament (or rather the readings of such MSS.) under the heads of Neutral, Western, Alexandrian and Syrian. Does Dr. Gregory really think that we are likely to accept the substitutes which he proposes, Original Text, Re-wrought Text, Polished Text and Official Text ? For a scholar who does not accept Dr. Hort's theory of the genesis of the various readings in the New Testament, every one of these terms is a *Petitio Principii*. The terms might

serve a student in an examination, who wished to recall theories which he had imperfectly digested, but they are hardly likely to be accepted by scholars of any party ; it would be better to distinguish classes of readings by the letters of the alphabet than by Dr. Gregory's fantastic terms.

Sometimes he is obscure from sheer want of sympathy with his readers, as when on p. 101 he is trying to show that Papias' lost works could not have contained words of Jesus not found in our Gospels. "How eagerly would Eusebius have told us of the contents of the book had that been its description ! How would Anastasius of Sinai in the sixth century have revelled in a book with new words of Jesus !" How many readers will be able to assign the reason for this abrupt introduction of the sixth century Sinaitic monk ?

But now we come to a more serious matter, the existence of a number of surprising errors, which seem to have escaped the notice of both the writer and certain of his reviewers.

On p. 239 we are told that the Epistle of Clement of Rome does not appear to have been translated into Latin, so that there is not even a question as to its scriptural authority in the Latin Church !

Apparently the writer is not aware that the Latin translation of Clement's Epistle was published some years since by Dom Morin ; it attracted a good deal of attention at the time, and, in particular, met with some very illuminating criticism at the hands of Dr. Sanday, who brought forward reasons for believing that the translation had been used by St. Ambrose. In any case it must have been a very early piece of work. While we are speaking of Clement of Rome, we may point out a curious blunder which Dr. Gregory makes in his account of Wetstein's New Testament. On p. 448 we are told that "it contained also the letter of Clement of Rome, and the homily of

Pseudo-Clement, in Syriac and Latin, at the close of the second volume." Now it is quite true that there are a couple of Syriac epistles ascribed to Clement at the end of the second volume of Wetstein's New Testament, but they are not the pieces described by Gregory, but the two Epistles commonly known as Clement's Epistles to Virgins; as any one can verify who will take the trouble to look up Wetstein's edition. The error has arisen in re-editing from the Prolegomena into the volume before us; the statement in the Prolegomena is "*duae epistolae S. Clementis Romani* [Syr.-Lat.]."

A curious mistake, probably arising from want of close attention to what one is writing, will be found in the description of Julius Africanus: on p. 429 we are told of Africanus that "he probably lived from about 170 to 240," and that "he wrote a letter to Aristides touching the conflicting genealogies of Jesus! And in accordance with this we have the statement on p. 431 that "the third century offers us, in Syria, Julius Africanus, who might have been connected with the close of the second century."

But then, a little higher up the same page, we find the surprising statement that "In Greece two apologists come to meet us, Aristides, to whom Julius Africanus wrote the letter about the genealogies of Jesus, and Athenagoras." If Africanus was not born before 170, it is not easy to see how he wrote to Aristides, the Athenian philosopher, in the early part of the second century.

Another curious error, arising probably out of mere carelessness, will be found in the description of the letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne. On p. 142 we are told that "Vienne is the place to which Herod was sent as an exile with Herodias after the murder of John the Baptist. Josephus the Jewish historian says so." Now, I do not think that Josephus connects the exile of Herod

with the death of John the Baptist, which appears to be a gratuitous addition to the reference to the exile: Herod certainly was not exiled before that event, and it is not clear why the head of St. John has to be introduced. But neither does Josephus say that Vienne was the place of exile; he says Lyons: "he appointed Lyons, a city of Gaul, to be his place of habitation" (*Antiq.* xviii. 7, 2).

On p. 208, in analysing the Biblical quotations in the letter of Polycarp, there is a curious mistake in the name of the avaricious presbyter at Philippi over whom Polycarp laments: "Polycarp quotes directly second Thessalonians in speaking of the erring presbyter *Valentus* and his wife." The name is usually edited as Valens, and in confirmation it may be noted with Lightfoot that Valens was a common name at Philippi. Has Dr. Gregory any special reason for spelling the name Valentus, and is Lightfoot's evidence from the inscriptions not to the point?

To carelessness must, I suppose, be assigned a statement made on p. 426 concerning the Diatessaron of Tatian. "We possess it to-day unfortunately neither in Greek nor in Syrian. Wherever it appeared—it also passed over into Armenian and into Arabic—it must have exerted the same confusing and confounded evidence!" Here "Syrian" is Gregory's way of writing "Syriac," I suppose, in order to make the word parallel with Armenian, Georgian and similar forms; in that case why reserve Arabic? But surely there is no evidence as yet that the Diatessaron passed over into Armenian. The most that we have in that direction consists in the fragments embedded in the Armenian translation of Ephrem's comment on the Diatessaron, which is a very different thing from an Armenian Diatessaron.

When we come to examine the evidence produced for the circulation and acceptance of the various books of

the New Testament, we find a number of errors which ought to have been avoided, as well as a reactionary treatment of the whole subject. Take, for example, the following judgment upon a passage of Theophilus of Antioch (p. 169): "The following points doubtless to Matthew: And all things whatsoever a man does not wish to be done to himself, that he should neither do to another." One would have supposed that by this time enough had been written on the Golden Rule and its negative form, to make it impossible for a critic hastily to assign such a passage to Matthew: why not to the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, or to Hillel or Tobit, or to the Western text of the Acts in the letter from Jerusalem? for observe that the fact of its parallelism with the positive precept from Matthew does not prove anything: it might be the complementary part of a complete saying of Jesus, and in any case the negative form, in view of the multitude of similar passages, proves its independence: Matthew *plus* some one else is not likely to be Matthew.

In the same way when he is trying to demonstrate that the Gospel of Matthew is quoted in the Epistle of Barnabas, he says (p. 164) as follows:

"When he writes (c. 19) 'Thou shalt not approach unto prayer with an evil conscience,' he may have the words of Jesus in Matthew in his mind, but it is not necessary that he should. His words (c. 19) 'Thou shalt not hesitate to give, nor when thou givest shalt thou murmur; but thou shalt know who is the good payer-back of the reward,' looks very like a reference to the sixth chapter of Matthew."

Is it possible that Dr. Gregory does not know that the whole of the section of Barnabas from which he is quoting is an extract from the Teaching of the Apostles or, at all events, from a Jewish document underlying the teaching? What confidence can be placed in his reconstruction of

the sub-apostolic Canon, when the materials are arranged so loosely as in the foregoing identifications ?

On p. 171, in searching for traces of the Gospel of Luke amongst the Ophites, we find the following extract from Hippolytus given and commented on : "The blessed nature of things past and things present and things to come, which is at one and the same time concealed and revealed, which he says is the kingdom of heavens sought within a man. Then they quote the apocryphal Gospel of Thomas. The words in Luke are : For behold the kingdom of God is within you. We know how readily the kingdom of heaven or the heavens is written for the kingdom of God. That is one of the instances of the influence of the Gospel according to Matthew." Has Dr. Gregory examined the fragments of the sayings of Jesus published by Grenfell and Hunt, and in particular has he noted the sentence, "and the kingdom of the heavens is within you," and the ascription of the whole collection to the Apostle Thomas ? Is it necessary to say that the Ophites have quoted Luke modified by Matthew ?

Still more unfortunate is the treatment of another Ophite text, which immediately follows the preceding :

"One passage that they use looks a little like the seven times sinning of the brother as given by Luke : 'And this is that which is spoken, they say, in the Scripture, Seven times the righteous will fall and will rise again. If they have not this place in view, it is hard to say what had induced the form of the sentence.'"

Would it not be sufficient to put Proverbs xxiv. 16 on the margin, and delete the reference to Luke altogether ?

While we are referring to the Ophites and to the Biblical text involved in their curious writings, it is interesting to refer to a passage which they quote from the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Dr. Gregory points out that they "play upon the word for 'ends' in 1 Corinthians x. 11, using it also in the sense of 'customs' : 'For tax-gatherers,

they say, are those taking the customs of all things, and we, they say, are the tax-gatherers: upon whom the customs (taxes, instead of ends) of the ages have fallen.' And they go on to discuss the word."

It was Dr. J. H. Moulton who first pointed out, from the language of the papyri, that the word here used by St. Paul, *κατήντηκεν*, was the proper word for the devolution of an inheritance. To which I added the remark that, in that case, the word *τέλη* could be taken in the sense of revenues, so that we could get rid of the reference to the "coming of the ends of the world," and say that these things happened for our education, "upon whom have devolved the revenues of the ages." This strikingly modern language about the "heirs of all the ages" is involved in the passage quoted from the Ophites, who have clearly anticipated Dr. Moulton and myself in the explanation of the passage. There is no play upon words, as Dr. Gregory suggests, at this point: the play upon the word *τέλος* begins when the Ophite teacher turns from the correct exegesis of the passage in 1 Corinthians to find the same word *τέλος* in another sense in the *συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος*. And the Ophite passage would have been clearer, if it had been rendered as follows: "For the revenue-officers are those who receive the revenues of all things; and we, says he, are the revenue-officers, to whom have devolved the revenues of the ages."

By the way, Dr. Gregory's translations of the Greek passages that he quotes will often set one thinking, and contradicting. My eye is resting at present on the famous saying of Jesus, which Clement of Alexandria quotes from the Gospel according to the Hebrews: (p. 250, "In the Gospel according to the Hebrews it is written, He that admires shall rule, and he that ruled shall cease.")¹

¹ ὁ θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει, καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαύσεται (!).

The interest of this passage lies in the fact that it is an abbreviation of a longer saying of Jesus found amongst the papyri from Oxyrhyncus. It is the first saying in the book of Sayings of Jesus which have caused so much excitement amongst critics and theologians, and it runs as follows: "Jesus saith: Let not the seeker desist from his quest until he finds; when he finds he shall be astonished; astonished he shall come to the kingdom,¹ and when he has come to the kingdom, he shall rest." It is obvious that a translation like Dr. Gregory's is not applicable, and it is difficult to attach a meaning to it.

The reactionary character of Dr. Gregory's work may be seen by comparing it with that of Westcott, or with the result given in the study of the *New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers* published by the Oxford Society of Historical Theology. Take, for example, the case of the letter of Polycarp: Dr. Gregory (p. 75) tells us: "It is plain that he had in his hands the Gospel of Matthew, and he probably had all four Gospels: he had all the Epistles of Paul, he had First Peter and First John, and he had that letter of Clement of Rome. I have no doubt that he refers to Acts in his first chapter." If we compare this with Westcott's tabulated results in the Appendix to the Canon of the New Testament, we shall find that his list of Polycarpian books contains Acts, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians (?), Philippians, 1 Thessalonians (?), 2 Thessalonians (?), 1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, 1 Peter, 2 Peter (?), 1 John. Note the difference between Gregory and Westcott in the treatment of the quotations from the Gospels. Then turn to the Oxford volume, and look at their table of results: of the Gospels they only recognize John as possibly quoted, other parallels being referred to a synoptic tradition, which need not be the same as our Gospels; and the certain

¹ So Grenfell and Hunt for βασιλεύσει.

quotations from the Epistles are limited to 1 Corinthians and 1 Peter, though most of the other Pauline Epistles are suggested, and, of course, 1 John. Westcott summed up the question of quotations from the Gospels by the admission that "no evangelic reference in the Apostolic Fathers can be referred certainly to a written record," although, on the other hand, "no quotation contains any element which is not substantially preserved in our Gospels." It will be seen that Gregory goes much farther than this; he evidently holds, with Dr. Ezra Abbot, that there never were any other accepted Gospels in the Church than the conventional four; but while it might have been so argued a quarter of a century ago, the case is altogether changed since the discovery of fragments of early Gospels and of early collections of Sayings of Jesus. The whole argument as to Polycarp's Gospels and Clement's Gospels and the coincident matter in the two is changed by the recognition of the new factor in the so-called Logia books. It pleases Dr. Gregory to ignore all this evidence, but it is vital for the question, and the neglect of it can only be described as reactionary.

For further study take Gregory's examination of the Evangelic elements in what is called the Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians. If one thing is clearer than another to an unprejudiced student of the Gospel problem, it is the dependence of 2 Clement on an uncanonical Gospel, and his non-dependence upon the canonical Gospels. Yet Gregory will not admit the latter part of this statement and struggles hard to escape from the former. He suggests that the writer quotes "haphazard from memory, as has been done even in modern sermons." . . . "It is good plain sermon quotation of our Gospels when he says, For the Lord saith, Ye shall be as lambs in the midst of wolves. If any one had called his attention to the words of Jesus,

Behold, I send you forth as lambs in the midst of wolves, he would have at once replied, 'That is just what I said, Ye shall be as lambs in the midst of wolves.' "

Notice here how completely Gregory ignores the conversation with Peter which follows in the homily, and which certainly was a part of the document from which the supposed Clement was quoting. Notice also, how he ignores the formula of the Logia-book, with which Clement opens. And when he admits that perhaps an extra-canonical Gospel may have been used, he diminishes the value of the concession by saying that "there is not the least reason to suppose that this preacher used any other New Testament than ours, in spite of his quotation from a strange gospel or so." All of which surprises us ; one would have supposed that a critic would have felt a thrill of joy at detecting a fragment of a lost Gospel. We always do ourselves ; but apparently Dr. Gregory is working from another point of view. Perhaps it is the mantle of Tischendorf that explains it. And this brings us to one other matter of regret in connexion with a really valuable book which is likely, as we stated at the opening of the article, to become a standard of reference for scholars. It is to be regretted that loyalty to Tischendorf's memory should have rendered it necessary, in Dr. Gregory's judgment, to continue his apologetic treatment of the manner in which Tischendorf acquired the famous Codex Sinaiticus for St. Petersburg. It is a mere misrepresentation of those who have put in an ethical objection to the way in which the document was alienated from the convent of St. Katharine, to ask them whether they really supposed Tischendorf carried off the book under his waistband—no one ever suggested anything of the kind. But Dr. Gregory's own documents are in evidence for the fact that for ten long years the monks endeavoured to recover possession of their treasure, and

it is idle to put that period of time down to the tardy diplomatics of the East. The Russian Government is the most rapid on earth in acquiring MSS. or similar treasures, as those know who have ever entered into rivalry with them. And they certainly would not have delayed ten years in an Eastern haggle over a book which they knew to be one of the treasures of the world and for which they were prepared to pay any price.

Nor is anything gained by depreciating the calibre of the Sinaitic monks of fifty years ago. For the matter of that, the wandering scholars have also changed for the better. Any one who has worked through Eastern monastic libraries knows that it is something like going over a recent field of battle. The books are torn and bleeding, and one knows that the wounds are fresh. Who is responsible? Dr. Gregory has one reply, Porphyry Uspenski, the bishop of Kieff. No doubt Porphyry enriched himself at the expense of the libraries which he visited, but so did Tischendorf; and the blame must be fairly distributed. Dr. Gregory speaks of Porphyry's performances, p. 381: "The Imperial Library [at St. Petersburg] contains a large number of fine leaves from valuable manuscripts which Porfiri Uspenski of Kiev cut, tore, stole out of all manner of books in the large Eastern libraries. How coarse and brutal he must have been!" *There are some similar collections elsewhere!*

But Dr. Gregory is to be congratulated on the abandonment of one myth, which has had wide circulation. Tischendorf always insisted, in his vivacious accounts of the finding of the Codex Sinaiticus, that he had rescued the book, in part at least, from the flames. "I perceived a large wide basket full of old parchments, and the librarian told me that two heaps like this had already been committed to the flames, etc." (*Discovery of the Sinaitic MS.*, p. 23).

What a run this myth has had, of a convent stove fed with parchment! unhappily for the statement, the basket is still there, a regular part of the library furniture, and not a suggestion can be found that it was ever used to carry vellum books to the kitchen for burning. But any story will be believed against the Sinaitic monks, even that they made fires with parchment.

If there is a direction in which Dr. Gregory has shown himself unduly rigid, where we should have wished that loyalty to Tischendorf might have been brought somewhat nearer to loyalty to the nature of the case, there is one passage that seems to require attention, in which his opinion has exhibited the most violent rebound conceivable. In his discussion (p. 452) of the text and labours of Scholz, he expresses himself as follows:

“This collection of various readings [of Scholz] was, and is still to-day, very important. The habit of decrying Scholz’s carefulness in collation appears to me to be unjustifiable. I have repeatedly compared his collations with the originals and found them to be very good.”

The language does not suggest that of a professor sitting on a stool of repentance: but here is what Dr. Gregory said of Scholz in the Prolegomena to Tischendorf: “*Haec omnia tamen fecit tam incredibili negligentia ut testimonium eius nisi ab aliis corroboratum ubique in dubium vocandum sit.*” There is no doubt about the swing of the pendulum here: who is right, the Professor of 1884 or the Professor of 1897? *Non liquet*. I can answer for Scholz’s descriptions of MSS.: they are very inaccurate. Of the texts I should like some further verification.

If the interval between 1884 and 1907 was long enough for Dr. Gregory to reform his judgment about Scholz, it ought, one would have supposed, to have been long enough to clear up some other points upon which he professes himself to be in perplexity. For instance, in regard to

that very interesting New Testament published by Mace in 1720, which first showed the way of progress to the textual critics in England, we find Dr. Gregory writing as follows :

P. 446. "I have tried in vain to find out something about a Presbyterian clergyman named William or perhaps Daniel Mace, who is said to have been a member of Gresham College in London. In the year 1729 he published, etc."

A reference to the Dictionary of National Biography will inform us that it was Daniel Mace, and not William. He died in 1753. He was Presbyterian minister at Newbury in Berks, where he is buried in the Meeting House. He has nothing to do with William Mace, who was Gresham Lecturer. I have not been able to verify all these points afresh, but the difficulty which Dr. Gregory was trying to clear up appears to be easily unravelled.

But it is time to bring this review to a close ; it ought to have been more appreciative of a really valuable and interesting book, but the path of progress runs through the correction of errors, even of people whom we admire, from whom we have learned much and expect to learn more.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

II.

ITS NATURE AS MIRACLE.

It is granted on all sides that the Christian Church was founded on, or in connexion with, an energetic preaching of the Lord's Resurrection from the dead. The *fact* may be questioned: the *belief* will be admitted.

"In the faith of the disciples," Baur says, "the Resurrection of Jesus Christ came to be regarded as a solid and unquestionable fact. It was in this fact that Christianity acquired a firm basis for its historical development." ¹

Strauss speaks of "the crowning miracle of the Resurrection—that touchstone, as I may well call it, not of Lives of Jesus only, but of Christianity itself," and allows that it "touches Christianity to the quick," and is "decisive for the whole view of Christianity." ²

"The Resurrection," says Wellhausen, "was the foundation of the Christian faith, the heavenly Christ, the living and present head of the disciples." ³

"For any one who studies the marvellous story of the rise of the Church," writes Dr. Percy Gardner, "it soon becomes clear that that rise was conditioned—perhaps was made possible—by the conviction that the Founder was not born, like other men, of an earthly father, and that His body did not rest like those of other men in the grave. . . ." ⁴

"The Resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ," says Canon Henson, "has always been regarded as the corner-stone of the fabric of Christian belief; and it certainly has from the first been offered by the missionaries of Christianity as the

¹ *History of the First Three Centuries* (E. T.) i. p. 42.

² *New Life of Jesus*, i. pp. 41, 397.

³ *Einleitung in die Drei Ersten Evangelien*, p. 96.

⁴ *A Historic View of the New Testament*, Lect. v., Sect. 5.

supreme demonstration of the truth which in that capacity they are charged to proclaim.”¹

“There is no doubt,” affirms Mr. F. C. Burkitt, “that the Church of the Apostles believed in the Resurrection of their Lord.”²

All which simply re-echoes what the Apostle Paul states of the general belief of the Church of his time. “For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received: that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried: and that He hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures.”³

Here, then, is a conceded point—the *belief of the Apostolic Church in the Resurrection of the Lord*. It is well to begin with this point, and to inquire what the *nature* of the belief of the earliest Church was. Was it belief in visionary or spiritualistic appearances? Belief in the survival of the *soul* of Jesus? Belief that somehow or somewhere Jesus lived with God, while His body saw corruption in the tomb? Or was it belief that Jesus had actually risen in the body from the grave? That He had been truly dead, and was as truly alive again?

If the latter was the case, then beyond all question the belief in the Resurrection of Jesus was belief in a true *miracle*, and there is no getting away from the alternative with which this account of the origin of Christianity confronts us. Strauss states that alternative for us with his usual frankness. “Here then,” he says, “we stand on that decisive point where, in the presence of the accounts of the miraculous Resurrection of Jesus, we either acknowledge the inadmissibility of the natural and historical view of the life of Jesus, and must consequently retract all that precedes, and

¹ *The Value of the Bible and Other Sermons*, p. 201.

² *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 74.

³ 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.

so give up our whole undertaking, or pledge ourselves to make out the possibility of the result of these accounts, i.e., the origin of the belief in the Resurrection of Jesus, without any corresponding miraculous fact.”¹

Now, that the belief of the Apostles and first disciples was really belief in a *true physical Resurrection*, in other words, a Resurrection of the body of Jesus from the grave, it seems impossible, in face of the evidence, to doubt. Few of the writers above cited *do* doubt it, whatever view they may take of the reality lying behind the belief. We are happily not here dependent on the results of a minute criticism of the Gospels or of other New Testament texts. We are dealing with a belief which interweaves itself, directly or indirectly, with the whole body of teaching in the New Testament. If Harnack makes a distinction between the Easter “message” and the Easter “faith,” it is certain that the first Christians made no such distinction. This admits of ample proof.

Take first the narratives in the Synoptics. There are three of these, in St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. Luke, and the cardinal feature in each is the empty tomb, and the message to the women and through them to the disciples, that the Lord had risen. “He is not here, He is risen.”² The body had left the sepulchre. It is not otherwise in St. John. The Magdalene, and after her Peter and John, whom she brings to the spot, find the tomb empty.³ It is to be remembered that there are several other miracles of resurrection in the Gospels,⁴ and these throw light on what was understood by Resurrection in the case of the Master. They

¹ *Ut supra*, i. p. 397.

² Matt. xxviii. 6; Mark xvi. 6; Luke xxiv. 6, 22, 24.

³ John xx. 2-13.

⁴ Matt. ix. 18, 23-25; Mark v. 33-43; Luke vii. 11-15, viii. 49-56; John xi.; cf. Matt. xi. 5, and Christ's repudiation of the Sadducean denial of the resurrection, Matt. xxii. 29-32.

were all bodily resurrections. The professed fear of the authorities that the disciples might steal away the body of Jesus, and say, "He is risen from the dead," points in the same direction.¹

With this belief in the bodily Resurrection correspond the narratives of the appearance of the Risen One to His disciples. It is not the truth of the narratives that is being discussed at this stage, though indirectly that is involved, but the nature of their testimony to the Apostolic belief, and on this point their witness can leave little doubt upon the mind. The appearances to the women,² to the Apostles,³ to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus,⁴ to the disciples in Galilee,⁵ all speak to a person who has risen in the body—not to an incorporeal spirit or phantom. The conditions of existence of the body were, indeed, in some respects supernaturally altered,⁶ as befitted the new state on which it had entered, and was yet more fully to enter. But it was still a body which could be seen, touched, handled; which evinced its identity with the body that had been crucified, by the print of the nails and the spear-mark in the side.⁷ These marks of His passion, it is implied, Jesus bears with Him even in the body of His glory.⁸ He walked with His disciples, conversed with them, ate with them: "shewed Himself alive," as Luke says, "after His passion by many proofs."⁹ If any tangible evidence could be afforded of the real Resurrection of the Lord from the grave, it was surely furnished in that wonderful period of intercourse with His disciples, prior to the final Ascension to His Father.

What the Gospels attest as the belief of the Apostolic

¹ Matt. xxvii. 64.

² Matt. xxviii. 9, 10; John xx. 14-18; cf. Mark xvi. 9.

³ Luke xxiv. 36-43; John xx. 19-29; cf. Mark xvi. 14.

⁴ Luke xxiv. 13-32.

⁵ Matt. xxviii. 16 and 17; John xxi.

⁶ This is touched on below. ⁷ Luke xxiv. 39-40; John xx. 24-28.

⁸ Cf. Rev. v. and vi.

⁹ Acts i. 3.

Church on the nature of the Resurrection is amply corroborated by the witness of Paul. It is, indeed, frequently argued that since Paul, in the words, "He appeared ($\omega\phi\theta\eta$) to me also," puts the appearance of the Lord to himself at his conversion in the same category with the appearances to the disciples after the Resurrection,¹ he must have regarded these as, like his own, visionary.² Canon Henson repeats this objection. "The Apostle, in classing his own 'vision' of the risen Saviour on the road to Damascus with the other Christophanies, allows us to conclude that in all the appearances there was nothing of the nature of a resuscitated body, which could be touched, held, handled, and could certify its frankly physical character by eating and drinking."³ This, however, is to miss the very point of the Apostle's enumeration. Paul's object in his use of "appeared" is not to suggest that the earlier appearances were visionary, but conversely to imply that the appearance vouchsafed to himself on the road to Damascus was as real as those granted to the others. He, too, had veritably "seen Jesus our Lord."⁴ That Paul conceived of the Resurrection as an actual reanimation and coming forth of Christ's body from the tomb follows, not only from his introduction of the clause, "and that He was buried,"⁵ but from the whole argument of the chapter in Corinthians, and from numerous statements elsewhere in his Epistles.

In 1 Corinthians xv. Paul is rebutting the contention of the adversaries in that Church that there was no resurrection

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 3-9.

² Thus, e.g., Weizsäcker (*Apostolic Age*, E. T. i. pp. 8, 9), Pfeiderer (*Christian Origins*, E. T., pp. 136-137, 160-161). Weizsäcker says: "There is absolutely no proof that Paul presupposed a physical Christophany in the case of the older Apostles. Had he done so he could not have put his own experience on a level with theirs. But since he does so we must conclude that he looked upon the visions of his predecessors in the same light as his own."

³ *Ut supra*, p. 204.

⁴ 1 Cor. ix. 1.

⁵ 1 Cor. xv. 4.

from the dead for believers, and he does this by appealing to the Resurrection of Christ. The latter fact does not seem to have been disputed. If there is no resurrection from the dead, Paul argues, then Christ has not risen; if Christ has risen, His Resurrection is a pledge of that of His people.¹ It is perfectly certain that the sceptics of Corinth were not denying a merely *spiritual* resurrection; they evidently believed that death was the extinction of the individual life.² As little is Paul contending in his reply for a merely spiritual resurrection. He contends for a resurrection of the *body*, though in a transformed and spiritualized condition.³ Professor Lake will concede as much as this. "There can be clearly no doubt," he says, "that he [Paul] believed in the complete personal identity of that which rose with that which had died and been buried."⁴ As respects Christ, "He believed that at the Resurrection of Jesus His body was changed from one of flesh and blood to one which was spiritual, incorruptible, and immortal, in such a way that there was no trace left of the corruptible body of flesh and blood which had been laid in the grave."⁵ This, however, need not imply, as Professor Lake supposes it to do,⁶ that the transformation was effected all at once, nor exclude such appearances as the Gospels record between the Resurrection and Ascension.

The Apostle's view of the bodily Resurrection of Jesus is unambiguously implied in the various statements of his other Epistles. Thus, in Romans viii. 11 we have the declaration: "But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, He that raised up Christ

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 12-23. ² xv. 32. ³ xv. 33-57.

⁴ *Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 20.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 23.

⁶ *Ibid.* pp. 27 and 35. Canon Henson argues in the *Hibbert Journal*, 1903-4, pp. 476-493, that there is a contradiction between Paul and Luke in their conceptions of Christ's Resurrection body.

Jesus from the dead shall give life also to your mortal bodies through His Spirit that dwelleth in you." Here plainly it is the "mortal body" which is the subject of the quickening. Later, in verse 23 of the same chapter, we have: "Waiting for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." In Ephesians i. 19, 20, "the exceeding greatness of [God's] power to usward who believe," is measured by "that working of the strength of His might which He wrought in Christ, when He raised Him from the dead." In Philippians iii. 10, 11, 21, the hope held out is that the Lord Jesus Christ, awaited from heaven, "shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of His glory." The like implication of a bodily Resurrection is found in 1 Thessalonians iv. 13-17, and many more passages.

It seems unnecessary to accumulate evidence to the same effect from the remaining New Testament writings. No one will dispute that this is the conception in Peter's address in Acts ii. 24-32, and the statements in 1 Peter i. 3 and 21, iii. 21, are hardly less explicit. The Apocalypse emphasizes the fact that Jesus is "the firstborn of the dead."¹ "I am the first and the last, and the Living One; and I was dead, and behold, I am alive for evermore."² "These things saith the first and the last, who was dead, and lived again."³

On a fair view of the evidence, therefore, it seems plain that the belief of the Apostolic Church was belief in a true bodily Resurrection of Jesus Christ, and it is as little open to doubt that, if such an event took place, it was a *miracle*, i.e., a true supernatural intervention of God, in the strictest sense of the word. Whether that of itself suffices to debar the "modern" mind from accepting the Resurrection as an historical fact is matter for discussion, but there should

¹ Rev. i. 5.² Chap. i. 17, 18.³ Chap. ii. 8.

be no hesitation in conceding that a question of miracle is involved.

The only possible alternative to this is to assume that Jesus at His burial was *not really dead*—that His supposed death from crucifixion was in reality a “swoon,” and that, having revived in the “cool air” of the tomb, and issued forth, He was believed by His disciples to have been raised from the dead. This naturalistic explanation, although numbering among its supporters no less great a name than Schleiermacher’s,¹ is now hopelessly discredited. It was previously mentioned that Strauss practically gave the swoon theory its death-blow, and little has been heard of it since his time. “It is evident,” Strauss well says, “that this view of the Resurrection of Jesus, apart from the difficulties in which it is involved, does not even solve the problem which is here under consideration—the origin, that is, of the Christian Church by faith in the miraculous Resurrection of a Messiah. It is impossible that a being who had stolen half-dead out of the sepulchre, who crept about weak and ill, wanting medical treatment, who required bandaging, strengthening, and indulgence, and who still at last yielded to His sufferings, could have given to the disciples the impression that He was a Conqueror over death and the grave, the Prince of Life, an impression which lay at the bottom of their future ministry.”² The hypothesis, in fact, cannot help passing over into one of fraud, for, while proclaiming Jesus as the Risen Lord, who had ascended to heavenly glory, the Apostles must have known the real state of the

¹ It is doubtful how far Schleiermacher himself remained satisfied with this explanation given in his *Life of Jesus* (posthumously published). In his *Der christliche Glaube* (sect. 99), he takes up a more positive attitude, allowing, if not a direct, still a mediate connexion with the doctrine of Christ’s person, inasmuch as anything that reflects on the Apostles reflects back on Christ who chose them.

² *Ue supra*, i. p. 412

case, and have closely kept the secret that their Master was in concealment or had died.

Miracle, therefore, in the Resurrection of Jesus, cannot be escaped from, and it is well that this, the most fundamental objection to belief in the Resurrection, should be grappled with at once. It is, as before said, not the Resurrection alone that is involved in this objection, but the whole picture of Christ in the Gospels. That picture, as critics are coming to admit, is the picture of a supernatural personage throughout.¹ It is at least something to have it recognized that the Resurrection does not stand as an isolated fact, but is congruous with the rest of the Gospel history.

It is, however, precisely this element of the miraculous which, it is boldly declared, the "modern" mind cannot admit. The scientific doctrine of "the uniformity of nature" stands in the way. Nature, it is contended, subsists in an unbroken connexion of causes and effects, determined by immutable laws, and the admission of a breach in this pre-determined order, even in a single instance, would be the subversion of the postulate on which the whole of science rests. For the scientific man to admit the possibility of miracles would be to involve himself in intellectual confusion. Apart, therefore, from the difficulty of proof, which, in face of our experience of the regularity of nature, and of the notorious fallibility of human testimony to extraordinary events,² is held to present another insuperable obstacle to the acceptance of miracle, the very idea of a miraculous

¹ Cf. Bousset, *Was wissen wir von Jesus?* pp. 54, 57. "Even the oldest Gospel," this writer says, "is written from the standpoint of faith; already for Mark Jesus is not only the Messiah of the Jewish people, but the miraculous eternal son of God, whose glory shone in the world."

² Hume's famous argument against miracles turns in substance on the contrast between our unalterable experience of nature and the fallibility of human testimony to wonderful events.

occurrence is thought to be precluded. Even Dr. Sanday writes in his latest work, *The Life of Christ in Recent Research* : "We are modern men, and we cannot divest ourselves of our modernity. . . . I would not ask any one to divest himself of those ideas which we all naturally bring with us—I mean our ideas as to the uniformity of the ordinary course of nature."¹ As an illustration from a different quarter, a sentence or two may be quoted from the biographer of St. Francis of Assisi, P. Sabatier, who expresses the feeling entertained by some in as concise a way as any. "If by miracle," he says, "we understand either the suspension or subversion of the laws of nature, or the intervention of the First Cause in certain particular cases, I could not concede it. In this negation physical and logical reasons are secondary ; the true reason—let no one be surprised—is entirely religious ; the miracle is immoral. The equality of all before God is one of the postulates of the religious consciousness, and the miracle, that good pleasure of God, only degrades Him to the level of the capricious tyrants of the earth."²

The application of this axiom to the life of Christ in the Gospels, and specially to such a fact as the Resurrection, naturally lays the history, as we possess it, in ruins.³ There is no need, really, for investigation of evidence ; the question is decided before the evidence is looked at. Professor Lake quotes from Dr. Rashdall with reference to the reanimation or sudden transformation of a really dead body, in "violation of the best ascertained laws of physics, chemistry, and physiology" : "Were the testimony fifty times stronger than it is, any hypothesis would be more possible than that."⁴

¹ P. 204.

² *Life of St. Francis*, p. 433.

³ Cf., on the other hand, Kaftan's vigorous protest against this modern view of the world in his pamphlet *Jesus und Paulus*, pp. 4, 5, 9, 72. "I am no lover," he says, "of the modern view of the world ; rather I find it astonishing that so many thinking men should be led astray by this bugbear" (*Popenz*).

⁴ *Ut supra*, p. 269.

A word may here be said on the mediating attempts which have frequently been made, and still are made, to bridge the gulf between this modern view of the uniformity of nature and the older conception of the supernatural as direct interference of God with the order of nature, through the hypothesis of "unknown laws." This is what Dr. Sanday in the above-mentioned work calls "making both ends meet,"¹ and it commends itself to him and to others as a possible means of reconciliation between miracle and science. The hypothesis has its legitimate place in a general philosophy of miracles; for it is certainly not an essential part of the Biblical idea of miracle that natural forces should not be utilized. Even assuming that miracle were confined to the wielding, directing, modifying, combining or otherwise using, the forces inherent in nature, it is impossible to say how much, in the hands of an omniscient, omnipotent Being, this might cover. Still, when all this has been admitted, the real difficulty is not removed. There is a class of miracles in the Gospel—the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection may safely be placed among them, though they are not the only examples—which is not amenable to this species of treatment; miracles which, if accepted at all, unquestionably imply direct action of the Creative Cause. We have no reason whatever to believe—the Society of Psychical Research does not help us here—that hitherto unknown laws or secret forces of nature will ever prove adequate to the instantaneous healing of a leper, or the restoring of life to the dead. It is with regard to this class of miracles that the scientist takes up his ground. Assume what you will, he will say, of wonderful and inexplicable facts due to unknown natural causes: what cannot be admitted is the occurrence of events due to direct Divine intervention; what Hume would speak of as the effects of "particular volitions,"²

¹ P. 203.

² *Natural Religion*, Pt. XI.

or Renan, of "private volitions."¹ These, in his judgment, are cases of the interpolation into nature of a force which breaks through, rends, disrupts, the natural sequence, and can hardly be conceived of otherwise than as a disturbance of the total system. It is this objection the believer in the miracle of the Resurrection has to meet.

But can it not be met? It is granted, of course, that there are views of the universe which exclude miracle absolutely. The atheist, the Spinozist, the materialist, the monist like Hæckel, the absolutist, to whom the universe is the logical unfolding of an eternal Idea—all systems, in short, which exclude a Living Personal God as the Author and Upholder of the world—have no alternative but to deny miracle. Miracle on such a conception of the world is rightly called impossible. But that, we must hold, is not the true conception of the relation of God to His world, and the question is not—Is miracle possible on an atheistic, or materialistic, or pantheistic conception of the world? but, Is it possible and credible on a theistic view—on the view of God as at once immanent in the world, yet subsisting in His transcendent and eternally complete life above it—All-Powerful, All-Wise, All-Holy, All-Good? It is here, e.g., that a writer like Professor G. B. Foster, in his *Finality of the Christian Religion*, seems utterly inconsistent with himself in his uncompromising polemic against miracles.² He would be consistent if he took up Spinoza's position of the identity of God with nature. But he claims to hold by the Father-God of Jesus Christ, and expressly finds fault with "naturalism" because it denies ends, purposes, ruling ideas,

¹ *Philosophical Dialogues*, E. T., pp. 6 ff. "Two things appear to me quite certain . . . we find no trace of the action of definite beings higher than man, acting, as Malbranche says, by private volitions."

² He goes so far as to say that "an intelligent man who now affirms his faith in such stories as actual facts, can hardly know what *intellectual honesty* means" (p. 132).

the providence of a just and holy God. But by what right, on such a basis, is the supernatural ruled out of the history of revelation, and especially out of the history of Christ? Once postulate a God who, as said, has a being above the world as well as in it, a Being of fatherly love, free, self-determined, purposeful, who has moral aims, and overrules causes and events for their realization, and it is hard to see why, for high ends of revelation and redemption, a supernatural economy should not be engrafted on the natural, achieving ends which could not be naturally attained, and why the evidence for such an economy should on *a priori* grounds be ruled out of consideration. To speak of miracle, with P. Sabatier, from the religious point of view, as "immoral," is simply absurd.

On such a genuinely theistic conception of the relation of God to the world and to man, the scientific objection to miracle drawn from "the uniformity of Nature," while plausible as an abstract statement, is seen, on deeper probing, to have really very little force. Professor Huxley and J. S. Mill are probably as good authorities on science as most, and both tell us that there is no scientific impossibility in miracle—it is purely and solely a question of evidence.¹ What, in the first place, is a "law of nature"? Simply our registered observation of the order in which we find causes and effects ordinarily linked together. That they are so linked together no one disputes. To quote Mr. W. C. D. Whetham, in his interesting book on *The Recent Developments of Physical Science*: "Many brave things have been written, and many capital letters expended, in describing the Reign of Law. The laws of Nature, however, when the mode of their discovery is analyzed, are seen to be merely the most convenient way of stating the results of experience in a form

¹ Huxley, *Controverted Questions*, pp. 258, 269; Mill, *Logic*, Bk. III. chap. xxv.

suitable for future reference. . . . We thus look on natural laws merely as convenient shorthand statements of the organized information that at present is at our disposal.”¹ Next, what do we mean by “uniformity” in this connexion? Simply that, given like causes operating under like conditions, like effects will follow. No one denies this either. Every one will concede to Dr. Sanday “the uniformity of the *ordinary* course of nature.” If it were otherwise, we should have no world in which we could live at all. The question is, not, Do natural causes operate uniformly? but, Are natural causes the only causes that exist or operate? For miracle, as has frequently been pointed out, is precisely the assertion of the interposition of a *new* cause; one, besides, which the theist must admit to be a *vera causa*.²

Not to dwell unduly on these considerations, it need only further be remarked that it misrepresents the nature of such a miracle as the Resurrection of Christ—or of the Gospel miracles generally—to speak of miracles, with Dr. Rashdall, as “completely isolated exceptions to the laws of nature,”³ or as arbitrary, capricious breaks in the natural order, “violations” of nature’s laws. Miracles may well be parts of a system, and belong to a higher order of causation—though not necessarily a mechanical one. Professor A. B. Bruce, in this connexion, refers to Bushnell’s view of miracles as “wrought in accordance with a purpose,” what he calls “the law of one’s end,” and to the phrase used by Bishop Butler for the same purpose, “general laws of wisdom.”⁴ And is it not the case that, in any worthy theistic view, God must be regarded as Himself the ultimate law of all connexion of phenomena in the universe, and the immanent cause of its changes? This means that a free, holy Will is the

¹ Pp. 31, 37.

² Thus J. S. Mill.

³ See Lake, *ut supra*, p. 268.

⁴ *The Miraculous Element in the Gospels*, pp. 65–6; cf. Bushnell, *Nature and the Supernatural*, pp. 264–9; Butler, *Analogy*, Pt. II. chap. iv. sect. 3.

ultimate fact to be reckoned with in the interpretation of nature. The ultimate Cause of things has certainly not so bound Himself by secondary laws that He cannot act at will beyond, or in transcendence of them.¹

The following may be quoted from Professor A. T. Ormond's *Concepts of Philosophy*, as one of the latest utterances from the side of philosophy. Professor Ormond says: "As to the miracle, in any case where it is real, it is either intended in the divine purpose, or it is not. If not, then it has no religious significance. If, however, it be intended in the divine purpose, it then has a place in the world-scheme which evolution itself is working out. How could a genuine miracle contradict evolution unless we conceive evolution as being absolute? It is not evolution but the form of naturalism we have been criticising, that is inconsistent with any genuine divine happenings."²

It is granted, then, that, in the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, we are in presence of a miracle—a miracle, however, congruous with the character, personal dignity, and claims of Him whose triumph over death is asserted—and there is no evading the issue with which this confronts us, of an actual, miraculous economy of revelation in history. This assuredly was no exception—a single hole drilled in the ordinary uniform course of nature, without antecedents in what had gone before, and consequents in what was to follow. It belongs to a divine system in which miracles must be conceived as interwoven from the beginning.

¹ There are at least three cases in which direct creative action seems to be no "violation" of natural order, but rather to be called for in the interests of that order: (a) In the initial act of creation *establishing* the order; (b) in the founding of a *higher* order or kingdom in nature, e.g., at the introduction of life (organic nature), (c) where the exercise of creative energy is *remedial* or redemptive. In this last case the creative act is not disturbance or destruction of nature, but the restoration of an order already disturbed (Christ's Miracles of Healing, etc.).

² *Op. cit.* p. 603.

The Resurrection was a demonstration of God's mighty power ("the strength of His might" ¹); but was an act in which the Son Himself shared, re-taking to Himself the life He had voluntarily laid down. It is in the light of this miraculous character of the Resurrection we have to consider the phenomena of the appearances of the risen Lord, which otherwise may seem to present features difficult to reconcile. It is an error of Harnack's to speak of the ordinary conception of the Resurrection as that of "a simple reanimation of His mortal body." ² No one will think of it in that light who studies the narratives of the Gospels. They show that while Jesus was truly risen in the body, He had entered, even bodily, on a new phase of existence, in which some at least of the ordinary natural limitations of body were transcended.³ The discussion of these, however, belongs properly to another stage, and may here be deferred. Enough that the central fact be held fast that Jesus truly manifested Himself in the body in which He was crucified as Victor over death.

JAMES ORR.

¹ Eph. i. 19. ² *History of Dogma*, E. T. i. pp. 85-6.

³ Cf. the remarks on this subject in Dr. Forrest's *The Christ of History and Experience*, pp. 146 ff., and in Milligan, *The Resurrection of our Lord*, pp. 12 ff. Dr. Forrest says: "These contradictory aspects, instead of casting a suspicion on the appearances, are of the essence of the problem which they were intended to solve. Christ hovers, as it were, on the border-line of two different worlds, and partakes of the characteristics of both, just because He is revealing the one to the other. . . . During the forty days His body was in a transition state, and had to undergo a further transformation in entering into the spiritual sphere, its true home" (pp. 150, 152). Preludings of these changes are seen in the Transfiguration, the walking on the sea, etc.

THE PARABLE OF THE PEARL-MERCHANT.

“Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a merchant seeking goodly pearls ; and having found one pearl of great price, he went and sold that he had, and bought it.”—*Matthew* xiii. 45, 46.

TWENTY-THREE years ago there appeared in the EXPOSITOR, under the title of “The Twin Parables,”¹ a striking paper, written by the Rev. W. M. Metcalfe, contesting the ordinary view of the parable of “the Pearl of Great Price.” The author insisted that this story should be read in its strict grammatical construction and ought not to be forced into the grooves of the companion story of “the Hid Treasure,”—that, in fact, the second of the two is the counterpart and complement, not the duplicate of the first, and assigns to the kingdom of heaven an active, not a passive part in the search in question.

Notwithstanding the reply which appeared subsequently in the EXPOSITOR, and the general assent to the established interpretation, I have from that time been convinced that Mr. Metcalfe was right in the starting-point and main ground of his contention. What our Lord (as reported) actually said is, in the first instance, “The kingdom of heaven is like unto a treasure hidden in the field” (verse 44) ; in the second, “The kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a merchant seeking goodly pearls” (verse 45). If we are to take the words as they stand, the kingdom is in the former case *the thing sought*, in the latter it is itself *the seeker*. No reason is given by the expositors why the Speaker, if He intended an identical lesson, should have reversed the position of the two figures introduced in passing from the one picture to

¹ EXPOSITOR, II. viii., p. 54 (July, 1884). The reply is found in the December number of the same volume (pp. 468–472), from the pen of the Rev. J. H. Burn, M.A., endorsed by the then Editor, Dr. Samuel Cox. This was the last article that appeared under Dr. Cox’s auspices.

the other ; nor why the reporter, if he understood his Master to mean that "the kingdom" is the costly pearl, should have made Him say that it "is like unto a *seeker* of goodly pearls." Unquestionably, if verses 45, 46 had stood alone and been allowed to speak for themselves, the image of "the kingdom" must have been seen in "the man that is a merchant," and "the pearl of great price" would have been recognized as the treasure of the kingdom's quest. The form of the opening sentence is precisely that of verse 24, "The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man that sowed good seed in his field," and of chapter xx. 1, ". . . is like unto a man that is a householder" ; it closely resembles that of chapters xviii. 23, xxii. 2, xxv. 14 ; in all which examples the action of the Divine kingdom is compared to that which men of authority and enterprise adopt in the common undertakings of life. The same line of comparison is manifest in the parables of Luke xv. and John x. 11, and in the similes of Luke xi. 13, xviii. 2-8, etc.

Reading the twin parables in this light, one sees how well they match each other, and how the second of the pair completes, and in a sense corrects, the first. Between them they describe, upon both sides, the mutual courtship ever going on between the kingdom of God and the heart of man, which fills the history of revelation and forms the romance of the ages. The soul seeks the kingdom (verse 44) ; but still more, the kingdom seeks the soul (verses 45, 46). The antithesis is conceived in the same manner as that of Matthew xi. 12 (according to the proper rendering) : "The kingdom of heaven useth violence, and men of violence seize it,"—it wrestles and must be wrestled with ! But in this passage, exceptionally, the *human* side of the search and capture happens to come first. Jesus could not speak of man as a seeker for the heavenly treasure without reminding Himself that the seeking is rather on the *other* side ; the initiative and prime intention, the overtures

and proffers of friendship, are upon God's part ; and man's search after God is but his slow response to God's search after him. " Not that we loved God," cries St. John, " but that He loved us " ; " Ye did not choose Me," says Jesus to His disciples, " it was I that chose you." Never could our Lord forget that it was *His* business " to seek and save the lost "—the lost wealth of His Father's kingdom and sons of His Father's house ; and the thought of the kingdom being sought for and found by men, of necessity called up the counter-thought of its long and painful pursuit of men. His representation, in the picture of the Treasure-finder, of the eagerness aroused in men by the discovery of spiritual treasure required, surely, to be balanced by the representation of the Divine solicitude for man's recovery afforded in the image of the pearl-merchant. Jesus Christ is Himself the actor of this story ; He speaks out of His inmost consciousness, and betrays His ulterior purpose. The shadow of Calvary falls across His visions of the kingdom.

Our parable follows the main tenor of Christ's teaching about salvation, and falls in with a multitude of gracious sayings and images used by Him to set forth the redeeming grace of God at work in His mission. He is the Sower, flinging wide over God's field the life-conveying seed ; the Baker, thrusting the leaven into the heavy and sullen mass ; the Fisher, plying his net amid the teeming waters ; the Shepherd, going after his one lost sheep—this little stray world of ours, that is missed amongst the flocks of God's bright and happy worlds peopling the skies ; the Cottager, sweeping and raking amid the dust to recover her single lost coin ; and now He is the Merchant, ransacking the markets to find the world's most precious pearl, and laying out all that he has to win it.

The extreme words with which the parable closes were, doubtless, an enigma to the first hearers ; the historical

sequel has explained them. The doctrines of *the kingdom* and *the sacrifice* lay close together in our Lord's mind. He and the kingdom are one; and the cross stood always in His way to the throne. To suppose that at any time after His baptism and temptation Christ expected an easy success, the fruit of mere teaching and miracles, and thought to win the Messiah's crown by a bloodless victory, is to presume against the evidence and to miss the secret of Jesus. He certainly did not invite others to "sell all that they had" (as in the parable of the Hid Treasure) for the sake of entering the kingdom He was setting up, without contemplating a corresponding sacrifice for their sake upon His own part. When Jesus anticipates "selling¹ all that He has" to "buy" the pearl of price, this unbounded self-devotion on the kingdom's account is no more than that to which He summoned others in saying, "He that doth not take his cross and follow after Me, is not worthy of Me," than that to which He explicitly pledged Himself when He declared that "the Son of man hath come . . . to give His life a ransom."² The principle expressed in the words of John xii. 24-26 was no late conclusion forced upon Jesus by disappointment, it was the rooted conviction of His ministry: the "grain of wheat" which multiplies itself in dying, and the "man that is a merchant" who devotes his whole store to the purchase of one precious pearl, bespeak the same resolution fixed in the Redeemer's thoughts. The entire course of Jesus was

¹ Possibly, the difficult perfect tense (πέπρακεν) between the two aorists of the narrative (ἀπῆλθεν . . . ἡγόρασεν) is due to the Evangelist's reflexion on the sacrifice of Jesus as a *fait accompli*: "He went away and sold all that He had (yes, and He *has done it*!), and bought it" (ver. 46).

² "That Jesus spoke all the seven parables grouped together in this chapter at one time is not certain or even likely" (A. B. Bruce, in *E.G.T.*) St. Matthew, according to his wont, has strung them together. The sixth parable may, not improbably, have been spoken at a later point in Christ's ministry, when the cross was immediately in view, and in illustration of such a saying as that of chapter xx. 28; and St. Matthew (*ex hyp.*) may have placed it here on purpose to complement the fifth.

164 THE PARABLE OF THE PEARL-MERCHANT

“goodly pearls” inviting His purchase, of treasure for mind and heart scattered through the earth to be redeemed for Divine uses. But amidst the riches of the Lord that fill creation and the “goodly pearls” whereon He looked with delight, there shone “one pearl of great price” cast in the mire, weighed against whose worth the whole world was as nothing to Him ; for its purchase He had “come to give His life a ransom.”

Such, then, we are compelled to think, is the mystery of the kingdom of heaven couched in the image of the pearl merchant and his traffic ; Jesus is Himself *the trader* of the sixth parable, as He is the fisherman of the seventh and the sower of the first and second. But He does not speak for Himself alone. The “drag-net” of the seventh story requires many hands to help in the boat ; the King does not by Himself make up the kingdom, nor unaided secure its victories. He has servants and companions who share His plans, who carry forward and complete His undertaking. They are “the sons of the kingdom,” the heirs of its wealth and of its duties ; and what the Lord says concerning Himself in the guise of the merchant—concerning His estimate of men and things, and the sacrifice He is resolved to make—applies to these also, so far as they are embarked with Him and are members of His body. Two qualities, it appears therefore, must be found in those who deal in Christ’s merchandise and who are fit to have their part and lot with Him in the enterprises of God’s kingdom.

1. *A just appreciation.* They must understand the staple that they have to handle ; they must carry their Master’s standard of value, and His system of weights and measures, into their transactions.

The hero of our story is a *pearl-merchant* : and his business is his passion. He has his ideal—“*one pearl of great price*,” beside which all other property goes cheap. He posts

from market to market, he explores every secret hoard, he sounds the perilous seas to find this pearl of pearls—the jewel of the universe for him. Other wares tempt other men—dainty stuffs, lustrous gems, cunning artistry—he casts over them all a careless glance ; but let some new and rare pearl gleam out of that piled up merchandise, then his face kindles and his hand reaches out to clutch the treasure. And with the single-minded pursuit there comes the sure eye and delicate touch, the fine judgment, the appreciative power.

There can be no question of that which holds the place of the merchant's pearl of price in the Divine estimate and the reckonings of God's kingdom. The first page of Scripture, in its poem of Creation, tells us this. Day after day, with measured labour, the Maker wrought His world-work, sundering the elements, fixing the orbs of heaven, clothing the earth with life and beauty. As the fabric grew into shape, at stage after stage, He pronounced the sentence " Good " upon His accomplished labour. At last when the sixth day's task was finished and man appeared upon earth—a rational, affectionate, and willing creature, the Maker's image—" God saw everything that He had made, and, behold, it was *very good* ! " for then the setting had its jewel, and the world *a soul*. And so " God rested from all His work which He had created and made," keeping sabbath with His creature man. When, again, the time of the new creation came, one object governed its proceedings, as it had determined " the plan of the ages " now at last unfolded : " Thou shalt call His name Jesus," it was said to the mother of the Lord, " for He shall save His people from their sins." The salvation of the soul, the restoring of the lost fellowship of God with man, was the errand upon which God sent forth His Son,—“ to bless you in turning every one of you from your iniquities,” as St. Peter said to the Jewish people. To seize the reins

of secular dominion and to save the splendid civilization of Greece and Rome, to break the fetters of the slave and remedy out of hand the monstrous social wrongs of the age, to unlock the secrets of science, to endow the world with consummate productions of genius, to open the ways of commerce and fill the lap of universal man with plenty—such aims as these might have seemed worthy motives for a Divine mission; the Almighty Father is not indifferent to any of the efforts of His children to better their natural lot and to make the earth a fitter and happier dwelling-place. The beneficent miracles of Jesus gave signs of the direction of His social sympathies. But all other objects the Saviour of men passed by or set aside: “He gave Himself up for us, that He might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a people for His own possession,”—that He might bring back the alienated race to its Maker’s love. The world’s worth lies in hearts that can beat with love to God, minds that can think and adore, wills that freely and faithfully obey; these form the enduring substance of life and time. All else that the earth holds of goodliness—the wealth of empires, the treasures of art—is mere dross in comparison with this; is but as scaffolding for the house of heaven, or as fuel for the fires of judgment. “The world passeth away, and the desire thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever.”

Such at least was Christ’s judgment of values, such the measure that He applied to human dealings. Men of Christian sense and Christian taste carry this standard with them into their affairs, and base their reasonings on this axiom. Their life’s accounts are kept, not in terms of pounds, shillings and pence, but of faith, hope and love. Their wealth lies in the worth, actual or possible, of the human beings around them; it is summed up in items of character—of truth, purity, courage, intelligence, of uncomplaining patience and unselfish

affection and lowly piety, in the souls of their fellows. *Men* and not money, *people* not property, *persons* always and never mere things, constitute their absorbing interests, supply their ruling motives, and draw out their appreciative powers. Of these contrasted objects those who think with Christ will always sacrifice the latter to the former, at no point the former to the latter.

The social question can only be settled, in the personal or national sphere, by a Christian appreciation of life, by a sound sense of the value of the human personality,—“the brother for whom Christ died.” On the ground of this estimate all personal relations are to be adjusted in the kingdom of God and under the light shining from the person and the cross of Jesus—whether they be the relations of pastor and people, of parent and child, of master and pupil, or of the employer and his workmen, the mistress and her domestics, the tradesman and his customers, the imperial nation and the savage or heathen races politically or commercially dependent upon it. There is but one law of Christ, that holds wherever man comes into contact with man. When this “law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus,” this habit of judgment and appreciation, prevails amongst Christians and leavens society, as it is bound to do, when Christ’s people universally find the gold and pearls of life where Christ Himself did, the kingdom of God will quickly come.

2. It belongs further to the kingdom of God, when one has learnt to judge aright of life’s values, then to act promptly and bravely upon this estimate. Appreciation must be seconded by *resolute decision*.

Had Christ’s “merchant” been like many of ourselves, when he had found his quest and heard its price, he would have said: “Ah, I wanted that pearl above everything; it was the dream of my life! But the sum you name would beggar me; I should have to sell all that

I have to buy it." So it proved with the rich young ruler who inquired of Jesus the way to life eternal. The Lord looked on him with love ; he had spiritual impulses and a fine appreciation, he saw that it was the right and beautiful thing to follow such a Master. But when the Lord laid His unerring finger on the weak spot in the young man's nature, and bade him part with all earthly goods, looking only for "treasure in heaven," "his countenance fell at the saying"—he loved property more than people. It is our English idolatry !

Not so with the great Pearl-seeker and Master-merchant. When Christ had "found" His "pearl of great price"—had set His love upon our sin-bound race and counted the cost of its redemption—He laid aside His eternal glory for the state of an earthly babe, for a suffering human lot and the life of a despised and homeless teacher, for the contradiction of sinners, for buffeting and spitting and scourging, for the final horror and desolation of Calvary : "He emptied Himself,—He humbled Himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea the death of the cross." Jesus grudged nothing, He hesitated at nothing ; the whole wealth and capital of His being—His sinless manhood, the glory of His Godhead—He staked upon the enterprise ; He invested and sunk *Himself* in the work of man's salvation ; "He loved us, and gave *Himself* for us,"—He "went and sold all that He had" for His one pearl, "and *bought it*." That clinched the bargain, and fetched home the purchase : "Thou hast redeemed us to God with Thy blood !"

Such language is, to be sure, the language of parable. The atonement of Christ was no mercantile transaction, no more than is the soul's purchase of the heavenly treasure by its surrender of earthly good (in the fifth story) a mercantile transaction or the payment of an arithmetical equivalent. But the actualities of an "eternal redemption"—of the

offering rendered in the sinner's stead by perfect love and obedience, and weighed in the scales of an absolute righteousness—lie behind these figures of the market-place, which bring home so truly to our imagination the motive and effect of the Lord's vicarious sacrifice.

"If any man serve Me, let him follow Me," is the watchword of Jesus. He depicts Himself as the First-born of many merchant-brethren engaged in His traffic, as He was the Captain of a boat-full of "fishers of men." The task of the kingdom of God is, all through, a task of redemption, to be carried on by sacrifice. Until mankind is saved and the kingdom of heaven comes in its glory, there must always be that to "fill up on our part which is lacking of the afflictions of the Christ." "Hereby know we love," writes St. John, "in that He laid down His life for us; and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren." In such a world as this, love cannot be known otherwise. The Apostle John, surviving his Master for some seventy years, continually laid down his life in laying it *out* for others; St. Paul, in like fashion, protested "I die daily." But there are so many of Christ's servants who never quite "sell all" on His account; they give much, they do much—short of putting their whole selves into His work. They have never fairly given themselves away for His love's sake. Hence their personal failure, and the collective failure of much of our Church expenditure and missionary activity. For it takes a heart to win a heart; and one must give *all for all* to "know love." Every pettiest contribution that has a man's soul and will behind it, tells; nothing else tells or counts at all in Christ's redeeming kingdom. When a man or a community is once embarked on the enterprise of saving souls, every other interest, affection, ambition has to be subordinated, every faculty and every possession utilized for this consuming purpose. So Christ

judged and acted, and so those who are Christ's will judge and act after Him.

The soul of the world is a pearl of great price ; when the full price is forthcoming, it will be won for God.

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

LEXICAL NOTES FROM THE PAPYRI.¹

ἀθανασία.—*Syll.* 365⁴ (i/A.D.) τὸ μεγαλεῖον τῆς ἀθανασίας, of Caligula.

ἀθέτησις.—TbP 397 (ii/A.D.) ἡ[ν] καὶ ἀναδέδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἰς ἀθέτησιν καὶ ἀκύρωσιν, "which agreement she has surren-

¹ New abbreviations are the following :—

Str P = Strassburg Papyri, ed. Fr. Preisigke. Band i., Heft 1, 1906.

Lp P = Leipzig Papyri, ed. L. Mitteis. Band i., 1906.

Rein P = Papyri edited by Th. Reinach (Paris, 1905).

Ostr. = A. Wilcken's *Griechische Ostraka*.

BM III. = British Museum Papyri, ed. F. G. Kenyon and H. I. Bell, 1907. (The Museum papyri are cited by pages, the rest by numbers.)

Witk. = *Epistulae Privatae Graecae*, ed. S. Witkowski. Teubner, 1907. (Cited by pages. The reference to Witkowski's edition is regularly given as well as the original designation, since there is often a revised text : the commentary likewise is valuable.)

Syll. = *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, by W. Dittenberger. Second edition (Leipzig, 1898–1901). Cited by numbers. The following are all cited by pages :—

Mayser = *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit*, by E. Mayser (Leipzig, 1906).

Nägeli = *Der Wortschatz des Apostels Paulus*, by Th. Nägeli (Göttingen, 1905).

Proleg. = *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, by J. H. Moulton. Vol. i., Prolegomena. Second edition (Edinburgh, 1906).

Thess. = *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians*, by G. Milligan (Macmillan, 1908). References will sometimes be made by chapter and verse).

Notes i., ii., iii. denote previous papers in this series : see EXPOSITOR, vi. iii. 271, vii. 104, viii. 423 respectively.

The dates of papyri are regularly given, except sometimes for the Petrie and Hibeh collections, which are entirely Ptolemaic.

Square brackets denote supplements made by the editors where the document has a gap. We have not reproduced these where the missing letters are few and admit of no possible doubt.

Roman capitals are used in abbreviations for papyri collections, italics for those of inscriptions and ostraca.

For other abbreviations see *Proleg.*² pp. xvii.–xx., 258–262.

dered to them to be annulled and cancelled " (G. and H.) : see *BS* 228 f.

ἀθυμέω.—AP 37 (Witk. 69—ii/B.C.) *μὴ ἀθύμει*.

ἀθῶος.—OP 237 (ii/A.D.) *οὐδὲ τότε ἀθῶος ἐσόμενος, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τεταγμένοις ἐπιτίμοις ἐνεχόμενος*, "and even so he shall not escape his liabilities, but shall be subject to the legal penalties"—a legal opinion quoted in the lengthy Petition of Dionysia. An earlier example is afforded by TbP 44 (ii/B.C.), where certain precautions are taken lest an assailant *ἀθῶιος διαφύγηι*, "should escape unpunished." Cf. *Syll.* 790⁵⁹ *ἂν ἐὰν ὁμόσωσιν, ἔστωσαν ἀθῶοι*.

αἰγιαλός.—The word is common; but it may be noted that in TbP 79 (148 B.C.) it refers to the shore of Lake Moeris, in *ibid.* 82 and 83 that of a marshy lake then covering the neighbourhood of Medinet Nehâs (see G. and H. note p. 346) So KP 82 (ii/A.D.), TbP 308 (iii/A.D.).

αἶδιος.—In *OGIS* 56 (iii/B.C., the Canopus inscription of Ptolemy III.) it is ordained to pay *τιμὰς αἰδίου* in all the temples to Queen Berenice, who *εἰς θεοὺς μετῆλθεν* shortly before. So *ibid.* 248 (ii/B.C., Antiochus Epiphanes) *τὰ καλὰ τῶν ἔργων εἰς αἶδιον μνήμην ἀνάγων*. In *ibid.* 383 Antiochus I. of Commagene (i/B.C.) claims that *περὶ ἱεουργιῶν αἰδίων διάταξιν πρέπουσαν ἐποιησάμην*. The phrase *τ. αἶδιον χρόνον* is common in the inscriptions, e.g. *Syll.* 11⁵; 96⁶.

αἵρεσις.—The two meanings (1) *animus, sententia*, and (2) *secta, factio*, are both illustrated by Dittenberger in *OGIS*; for (1) he gives fourteen examples from i/B.C. or earlier, for (2) only three, of equal antiquity, viz. 176 *τῆς Ἀμμωνίου αἱρέσεως*, 178 similar (both from reign of Ptolemy XI., ii/i B.C.), and 442 (a *senatus consultum* of i/B.C., apparently) *Σύλλ]ας αὐτοκράτωρ συνεχώρησεν [π]όλ[εις ὅπως ἰδί]οις τοῖς νόμοις αἱρέσεσιν τε ὦσιν*. (Note the effect of slavish translation from Latin ablative.) 2 Peter ii. 1 is the only New Testament passage assigned by Grimm to the first head,

and there the Revised Version has a margin assigning it to (2). In the papyri the meaning seems generally "choice"; TbP 27 (ii/B.C.) shows the pure verbal noun "receiving," and OP 216 (ii/A.D.) gives "bid" (at an auction): so also BU 656 (ii/A.D.) προσερχέστωσαν (i.e. -θωσαν) τοῖς πρὸς τούτοις ἔρεσειν (i.e. αἵρεσιν) διδόντες. Tb P 28 (ii/B.C.) comes nearest to the meaning (1)—καὶ κατὰ τὸ παρὸν διὰ τῶν ἀναφ[ορῶν] τῇ αὐτῇ αἵρέσει κεχρημένων, which the edd. render "since they show the same behaviour in their reports." This use gives us a foretaste of the development in *malam partem*, producing "factiousness" and then "heresy." Cf. *Syll.* 308²⁸ (ii/B.C.) γίνονται δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι ζηλωταὶ τῆς αὐτῆς αἵρέσεως. Herwerden cites an inscription from Delphi of iii/B.C. (*BCH* xx. p. 478) where the word equals εὐνοια: ἐνεφάνισε τὰν αἵρεσιν, ἃν ἔχει ποτὶ τε τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ τὰν πόλιν. In *Syll.* 367 (i/A.D.) αἵρεσιάρχης means the chief of the profession (medical). For the verb αἵρετίζω see *Syll.* 633² αἵρετίσαντος (το)ῦ (θ)εοῦ ἐπ' ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ.

αἵρέω.—Note GH 36 (Witk. 91—i/B.C.) περὶ ὧν ἐὰν αἰρήτε "whatever you desire me to do": see Witkowski's parallels for the "barbarism" αἵρεῖν for αἵρεῖσθαι, also *Proleg.* 159.

αἶρω.—On αἶρε or ἄρον αὐτόν see below under ἀναστατόω, and cf. *Syll.* 737¹⁴² (ii/iii A.D.) αἵρέτωσαν αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ πυλῶνος. Αἶρειν is used six times in the curious nursery alphabet, TbP 278 (early i/A.D.) for stealing (a garment).

αἰσθάνομαι.—PP III. 56 (c) ἐάν τινα αἰσθώμαι.

αἰσχύνω.—Par P 49 (Witk. 47—ii/B.C.) ἡσχυνται συμμειξαί μοι, and again οὐκέτι ἦκει πρὸς ἐμὲ αἰσχυνθείς. *Syll.* 802¹²² αἰσχυνόμενος δ[ὲ ἄτε] καταγελάμενος ὑπὸ τ. ἄλλων. The substantive is found in Par P 47 (Witk. 65—ii/B.C.).

αἰτία.—BU 267 (end of ii/B.C.), τοῖς δικαίαν αἰτίαν ἐσχηκόσι, apparently has αἰτία=*causa*, "case" or "plea." So identically in StrP 22 (iii/A.D.)—it was a legal formula. BU 136

(ii/A.D.) *κατὰ ταύτην τὴν αἰτίαν* = “on this excuse” or “reason,” like Matthew xix. 3, etc., a use which needs no illustration. A further legal use in PP III. 53n (Witk. 28—iii/B.C.) *ἀπέσταλται εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν πρὸς αἰτίαν, ὑπὲρ ἧς [ἀπ]ολογίζεται*, “charge.”

αἷτιος.—For the absolute use = “guilty,” cf. P Fi 9 (255 A.D.): *ὁ αἷτιος* = “the author” occurs in *Syll.* 737⁸⁰ *ὁ αἷτιος γενόμενος τῆς μάχης*.

αἰφνίδιος.—A contemporary example in FP 123 (100 A.D.), an uneducated letter: *αἰφνιδίως εἶρηχεν ἡμῖν σήμερον*: cf. *Syll.* 324²⁰ (i/B.C.) *αἰφνίδιον σ(υ)μφορὰν θεασάμενος*—also *ibid.* 326⁷.

αἰχμάλωτος.—This word is found in the newly-published Lille papyri, No. 3 (ii/B.C.) *αἰχμαλώτοις εἰς τὴν γινομένην σύ[νταξιν]*? In their note the editors think that the reference is to certain prisoners brought from Asia by Philadelphus (cf. PP II. 29(e)), to some of whom a regular “allowance” or “grant” (*σύνταξις*) may have been made.

αἰών.—*Magn.* 180 (ii/A.D.) *μόνος τῶν ἀπ’ αἰῶνος νεικήσας Ὀλύμπια*, etc.—the athlete is claiming to have made a “record.” Cf. *Syll.* 363⁶ (i/A.D.), 686⁴⁸ *al.* OP 33 (ii/A.D.) *θεωρήσατε ἓνα ἀπ’ αἰῶνος ἀπαγόμενον* “behold one led off to death,” lit. “from life.” OP 41 (iii/iv A.D.) is a curious report of a public meeting at Oxyrhynchus, punctuated with cries of *Ἀγουστοι κύριοι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα* “the Emperors for ever!”: cf. *OGIS* 515⁵⁵ with Dittenberger’s note. So *Syll.* 376⁵⁰ *Διὰ Ἐλευθερίῳ [Νέρων]ι εἰς αἰῶνα* (i/A.D.). See also *Magn.* 139 (i/B.C.) *εὐεργέτην δὲ γεγονότα τοῦ δήμου κατὰ πολλοὺς τρόπους πρὸς τὸν αἰῶνα*, *OGIS* 383⁴⁴ (i/B.C.) *εἰς τὸν ἄπειρον αἰῶνα*—passages which are sufficient to show how thoroughly “Greek” the prepositional combinations with *αἰών* are. Reference should be made to *Syll.* 757 (i/A.D.), an interesting inscription dedicated to *Αἰών* as a deity. For *αἰών* = period of life cf. *Syll.* 364⁹ (37 A.D.) *ὥς ἂν τοῦ ἡδίστου ἀνθρώποις αἰῶνος νῦν ἐνεστῶτος*.

αἰώνιος.—See *Notes* iii. p. 424 f. In *Syll.* 757 (i/A.D.—see under *αἰών*) note *θείας φύσεως ἐργάτης αἰωνίου* (of Time). *Syll.* 740¹⁸ (iii/A.D.) joins it with *ἀναφαιρετον*. GH 71 (iii/A.D.) *ὁμολογῶ χαρίζεσθαι ὑμῖν χάριτι αἰωνία καὶ ἀναφαιρέτῳ* is a good example of the meaning *perpetuus*; and from a much earlier date (i/B.C.) we may select *OGIS* 383 (a passage in the spirit of Job xix. 24): *Ἀντίλοχος . . . ἐπὶ καθωσιωμένων βάσεων ἀσύλοις γράμμασιν ἔργα χάριτος ἰδίας εἰς χρόνον ἀνέγραψεν αἰώνιον*. In his Index Dittenberger gives fourteen instances of the word. BU 176 (ii/A.D.) refers to the *αἰώνιος κόσμος* of Hadrian. Two examples from *OGIS* 569 (iv/A.D.) may be further quoted, addressed to the emperors Galerius and his colleagues: *ὑμετέρῳ θείῳ καὶ αἰωνίῳ [νεύματ]ι*, and *[ὑπὲρ] τῆς αἰωνίου καὶ ἀφθάρτου βασιλείας ὑμῶν*. Cf. BU 362 iv.¹¹ (iii/A.D.). LpP has twenty-seven instances of the imperial epithet, all late in iv/A.D. The word depicts that of which the horizon is not in view, whether the horizon be at an infinite distance, as in Catullus' poignant lines—

Nobis cum semel occidit brevis lux,
Nox est *perpetua* una dormienda,

or whether it lies no further than the span of a Caesar's life.

ἀκαθαροσία.—LpP 16 (ii/A.D.) is a pledge to leave a rented house in good condition, *ἀπὸ (= ἄνευ) πάσης ἀκαθαροσίας*—the word remains literal. So BU 393 (ii/A.D.), BM I. p. 187 (i/A.D.).

ἀκαιρέομαι.—The noun occurs in Par P 63 xii.⁹² (ii/B.C.) *διὰ τὴν περιέχουσάν μει κατὰ πολλοὺς τρόπους ἀκ[αι]ρίαν*, and the adjective in *Syll.* 730¹² (ii/B.C.) *αἱ λίαν ἄκαιροι δαπάναι*. BU 846 (ii/A.D.—uneducated) has *ἀκαίρως*.

ἄκακος.—BU 1015 (iii/A.D.) *λάχανον νέον καθαρὸν ἄδολον* [. . . ἄ]κακ[ον] must have a passive sense, "undamaged." So in OP 142 (vi/A.D.), a similar formula.

ἀκάνθινος.—In OP 646 (ii/A.D.) a legacy includes *κλείνη*

ἀκανθίνη, i.e. a couch made of acantha-wood (Herodotus ii. 96, Strabo 175): Dr. Kenyon (BM I. p. 140) calls it "the Egyptian acacia, from which gum arabic is obtained, and whose branches were in early times used for boat-building." Add BM III. p. 186 (l. 177); also PFi 50 (iii/A.D.) *ἀκανθῶσι*, groves of acantha. This evidence from the vernacular isolates further the word as used in Mark and John (Isa. xxxiv. 13), but the meaning there is not shaken.

ἄκαρπος.—*Syll.* 420³⁰ (i/A.D.) διὰ τ. γενομένας ἐφ[εξ]ῆς *ἀκαρπίας* τ. ἐλαιῶν.

ἀκατάγνωστος.—To Deissmann's examples (*BS* p. 200) from the inscriptions may be added BM I. p. 209 (a contract of vi/A.D.) *ἀκαταγνώστως καὶ ἀκαταφρονήτως*: cf. also the editor's restoration on p. 208.

ἀκαταστασία.—A literary citation for this word may be made from G 1 (ii/B.C.), the Erotic Fragment, where the faithless lover is called *ἀκαταστασίης εὐρετής*.

ἀκέραιος.—*Syll.* 210¹³ (iii/B.C.) τ. χώραν *ἀκέραιον*.

ἀκμάζω.—In his famous speech at Corinth, announcing freedom to the Greeks, Nero expresses regret that it had not been in his power to offer it *ἀκμαζούσης τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, so that more might have shared in his bounty (*Syll.* 376). The more literal sense appears in BM I. p. 72 (a magical papyrus, iv/A.D.) *ὅσα ἀκμάζει τῶν ὁπώρων*.

ἀκμήν.—In *OGIS* 201¹³ οὐκ ἀπῆλθον ὅλως ὀπίσω τῶν ἄλλων βασιλέων, ἀλλὰ ἀκμήν ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν, the adverb seems to have the meaning "valde, magnopere, longe" in accordance with the original meaning of *ἀκμή* (see Dittenberger's note). Cf. *Syll.* 326¹² παραλαβὼν τοὺς ἐν ἀκμαῖ τῶν πολιτῶν.

ἀκολουθέω.—PP III. 128, of journey-money "assigned to" an official. BU 1079 (41 A.D.) of following to get a favour.

ἀκρατής in the sense of "impotent" is found in *Syll.* 802, 803 (inscr. from Asclepios' temple).

ακρατος, “undiluted,” is still in use in modern Greek, as in the familiar cry of the milkman *ῥάτο γάλα*.

ἀκρίβεια.—Par P 63 ii.⁴⁵ (ii/B.C.) *μετὰ πάσης ἀκριβείας, τὴν ἐκτενεστάτην [ποι]ήσασθαι πρόνοιαν* combines some characteristic Lucan and Pauline words. A rather literary document, an advocate’s speech for prosecution—suspected by G. and H. of being a rhetorical exercise—contains the sentence *ἄμεινον δ’ αὐται καὶ σαφέστερον τὴν περὶ τοῦτο ἀκρίβειαν καὶ τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν Μαξίμου δηλώσουσιν* (OP 471, ii/A.D.), which the editors translate “These letters will still better and more clearly exhibit Maximus’ exactness and care in this matter.” Near the end of the Petition of Dionysia (OP 237, ii/A.D.) we have *μετὰ πάσης ἀκριβείας φυλασσέσθωσαν* (sc. *αἱ ἀπογραφαί*); and in PP III. 36 a prisoner complains to the Epimeletes that it was on account of the “punctiliousness” of his predecessor in office that he had been confined—*[ἀ]κριβείας ἔνεκεν ἀπήχθην*. The verb *ἀκριβεύειν* “to get exact instructions” comes in AP 154 (vi/vii A.D.).

ἀκριβής.—The word is fairly common. Hb P 40 (261 B.C.) *ἐπίστασο μέντον* (i.e. -τοι) *ἀκριβῶς*, 27 (iii/B.C.) *ὥς οὖν ἡδυνάμην ἀκριβέστατα ἐν ἐλαχίστοις συναγαγεῖν*, PP II. 16 (iii/B.C.) *πενσόμεθα ἀκριβέστερον*, give us early examples of the adverb. FP 19 (letter of Hadrian, or an exercise purporting to be such) *ἀκριβεστάτην μνήμην ποιούμενος*, and 20 (iii/iv A.D.) *εἰς τὸ ἀκριβέστατον δοκιμάσας*, illustrate further the popularity of the elative in -τατος, for which Luke uses the comparative form (see *Proleg.* p. 236). Dionysia has *ἀκριβεστέραν* with *ἐξέτασιν* (cf. Matt. ii. 8), also *ἀκριβῶς ζητεῖν* (OP 237—see above). Add *Syll.* 929³², TbP 287. Other citations are needless.

ἄκρος.—TbP 380 (i/A.D.) *οὐλὴ ὀφρύει δεξιᾷ ἄκρα* “a scar at the tip of the right eyebrow”: cf. *Syll.* 804⁹ *κιτρίου προλαμβάνειν* (=eat, see *s.v.*) *τὰ ἄκρα*. *Ibid.* 425^{7,9} (iii/B.C.) *κατὰ τῶν ἄκρων* “down the heights” (as often).

ἀκυρόω.—The adjective *ἄκυρος* is common in legal phraseology (e.g. it comes *quater* in the Ptolemaic HbP), and needs no illustrating. *Ἀκύρωσις* goes with *ἀθέτησις*—see Deissmann *BS* 228 f., or is used by itself, especially in the phrase *εἰς ἀκύρωσιν*, of a will or an IOU received back to be *cancelled*: so OP 107 (ii/A.D.), P Fi 25 (ii/A.D.) *al.* The verb occurs in the same sense in OP 491, 494, 495 (all ii/A.D.): cf. *Syll.* 329³⁰ (i/B.C.).

ἀκωλύτως.—The legal usage of *ἀ*. (see *Notes* iii. p. 425) may be further illustrated by BM III. p. 233, BU 917¹⁴, both from iv/A.D.; also by the Edmonstone Papyrus (OP vol. iv. pp. 202 f.) and LpP 26¹¹ (iv/A.D.), 30⁹ (iii/A.D.), BM III. p. 258 (vi/A.D.). It is legal to the last.

ἀλάβαστρον.—In PP II. 47 the words *ἐν Ἀλαβάστρον πόλει* occur in the subscription to a contract for a loan. From v/B.C. may be quoted *Syll.* 44.

ἄλας.—As early as iii/B.C. the neuter form is proved to have been in existence, e.g. PP III. 140 *ἔλαιον ν ἄλας ν ξύλα*, and may therefore be acknowledged in HbP 152 (250 B.C.) *ἐμβαλοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἄλας καὶ λωτόν*, though there the edd. translate as acc. plur. A clear example seems to be quotable from Par P 55² (ii/B.C.) *καὶ ἄρτοι καὶ ἄλας*. See Mayser p. 286 for other examples. Note *ἀλικῆς Ostr.* 1337 (iii/B.C.) = “salt tax.” As late as iii/A.D. *ἄλός* is found, BM III. p. 196.

ἀλείφω.—*Passim* in papyri. As against the contention that *ἀλείφω* is the “mundane and profane” and *χρίειν* the “sacred and religious” word (Trench), see PP II. 25 (a) where *χρίσιν* is used of the lotion for a sick horse.

ἀλέκτωρ.—*Notes* iii. p. 425: add BU 1067 (101/A.D.). It is noteworthy that *ἀλεκτρυνών* occurs in the well-known Gospel fragment (*Mittheilungen* of the Rainer Papyri, I. i. 54): *ὁ ἀ. δις κοκ[κύξει]*.

ἄλευρον.—BM I. pp. 77, 101 (magical); also III. p. 204 (iii/A.D.).

ἀληθής.—The word is only moderately frequent, and seems always to bear the normal meaning of “true in fact.” So *δρκος Ostr.* 1150 (Ptol.). Rather different is TbP 285 (iii/A.D.) τέκνα (cf. 293, of ii/A.D.). The noun ἀλήθεια occurs especially in prepositional phrases, μετὰ πάσης ἀληθείας, etc. Ἐπ’ ἀληθείας is found AP 68 (i/A.D.) ὁμνύομεν . . . εἰ μὴν ἐξ ὑγιοῦς καὶ ἐπ’ ἀ. ἐπιδεδωκέναι : so OP 480 (ii/A.D.) and *Syll.* 226 (iii/B.C.) οὐ γεγενημένου τούτου ἐπ’ ἀληθείας. In P Fi 32 (iii/A.D.) ἐξόμνυμι . . . ἐξ ἀληθείας καὶ πίστεως. We have noticed no early examples of ἀληθεύω.

ἀληθινός is less common still. In PP II. 19 (iii/B.C.) it is used in a petition by a prisoner who affirms that he has said nothing μηδέποτε ἄτοπον, ὅπερ καὶ ἀληθινόν ἐστι, and again (*si vera lectio*) *ibid.* 2 (260 B.C.), where the writer assures his father εἰ ἐν ἄλλοις ἀλύπως ἀπαλλάσσεις εἴη ἂν ὡς ἐγὼ τοῖς θεοῖς ἔσχομεν [χάριν ἀληθ]ινόν “if in other matters you are getting on without annoyances, may there be, as we feel, true gratitude to the gods” : cf. *Syll.* 316¹⁷ (ii/B.C.) πα]ρασχομένων τῶν κατηγορῶν ἀληθινὰς ἀποδείξεις. In an obscure letter concerning redemption of garments, etc., in pawn, OP 114 (ii/iii A.D.), we have ἀληθινοπόρφυρον translated by the edd. “with a *real* purple (border?).” In *OGIS* 223 (iii/B.C.) the Seleucid Antiochus Soter writes ἀπλάστως καὶ ἀληθινῶς ἐμ πᾶσι προσφερομένους.

ἀλιεύς.—PP III. 59, TbP 298 and 316, *Ostr.* 1029 *al.*

ἀλλά.—On ἀλλά apparently=πλήν in TbP 104 (i/B.C.), see the detailed note in *Proleg.* 241, and add PP II. 1, 46, BM III. p. 207 (i/A.D.) μέντοι γε οὐ θέλωι ἀλλὰ ἡ ἀνάγκη.

ἀλλάσσω.—*Syll.* 178^{14,22} κεκτῆσθαι καὶ ἀλλάσσεσθαι καὶ ἀποδόσθαι.

ἀλλαχόθεν.—OP 237 v.¹⁶ (ii/A.D.) serves to support John x. 1. The word is classical, though assailed by Atticists (Thayer).

ἀλλαχοῦ.—*Syll.* 418²⁸ ἀ. πεμπόμενοι.

ἀλλογενής is “nowhere in profane writers,” says Grimm. Besides the LXX, we have the famous inscription in the Temple, *OGIS* 598 (i/A.D.), beginning μηθένα ἀλλογενῇ εἰσπορεύεσθαι. Josephus, in his description of the tablet (*Bell.* v. 193) substitutes μηδένα ἀλλόφυλον παριέναι, a good example of his methods of mending the vernacular Greek he heard and read. Mommsen argued that the inscription was cut by the Romans. We might readily allow the word to be a Jewish coinage, without compromising the principle that Jewish Greek was essentially one with vernacular Greek elsewhere. The word is correctly formed, and local coined words must be expected in every language that is spoken over a wide area.

ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος.—For the formation cf. δειγματοάρτ(ην) and χωματοεπιμ(ελητής) *BM* III. p. 113 (ii/A.D.), the former also *OP* 63 (ii/iii A.D.).

ἀλλόφυλος.—*BU* 858⁵ (iii/A.D.) is the only instance we can quote for this classical word (*Acts* x. 28); but cf. Josephus above (under ἀλλογενής).

ἄλογος.—The adverb occurs in the curious acrostic papyrus of the first century, *TbP* 278, where the story of the loss of a garment is told in short lines, beginning with the successive letters of the alphabet. Thus—

ζητῶι καὶ οὐχ εὕρισκωι.

ἦρτε ἀλόγως.

“I seek, but do not find it. It was taken without cause.” In *FP* 19 (Hadrian’s letter) the sense of “unreasonably” seems clear, and so apparently *BU* 74 (adj.), *BM* III. p. 213 and *TbP* 420 (both iii/A.D.), *OP* 526 (ii/A.D.), *LpP* 111²⁰ (iv/A.D.), and *AP* 145 (iv/v A.D.). There is a curious use of a derived verb in *TbP* 138 (ii/B.C.), where an assailant σπασάμενος ταύτην [sc. μάχαιραν] βουλόμενός με ἀλογῆσαι κατήνεγκε πληγαῖς τρισὶ κτλ.—a rather aggressive “neglect”

or “contempt”! But ἄλογος=“brutal” is well seen in BU 22 (quoted under ἀηδία) and in some of the passages given above. We shall see a similar activity developed in καταφρονεῖν. The modern sense of “horse” is nearly approached in OP 138²⁹ (early vii/A.D.), where animals in harness are meant if not horses exclusively.

ἀλυκός occurs in BU 14 iv.²² (iii/A.D.) τυρῶν ἀλυκῶν. *Ibid.* 1069 ζύτου εὐπρατικοῦ καὶ ἀλυκῆς: the last two words are interlinear, and their relation is not clear—the writer is illiterate enough to mean “cheap and salted beer,” no doubt a popular beverage then as now. But query? Mayser (p. 102) shows that ἀλικός, really a distinct word, supplants the earlier ἀλυκός in Hellenistic.

ἄλυπος.—PP II. 13 (iii/B.C.=Witk. p. 17) τοῦ σε γενέσθαι ἄλυπον, *ibid.* 2 (iii/B.C.=Witk. p. 19) ἀλύπως ἀπαλλάσσεις, BU 246 (ii/iii A.D.) πῶς ἄλυπος ἦν.

ἄλυσις.—*Syll.* 586³⁶ (iv/B.C.), 588³² (ii/B.C.), *al.*

ἀλυσιτελής.—TbP 68³¹ (ii/B.C.) τῶν ἀλυσιτελῶν γενῶν of inferior crops, “unprofitable” by comparison with wheat.

ἄλων.—The old form ἄλως, in the “Attic” declension, is still very much more common in papyri; but the N.T. third declension form is found in TbP 84 (ii/B.C.) ἀλώνωι (= -ων—see *Proleg.* p. 49n), BU 651 (ii/A.D.) ἄλων, 759¹¹ (*ibid.*) and Str P 10 (iii/A.D.), BM III. p. 52 (iii/A.D.) and 281 (iv/A.D.) ἀλώνων. Cf. Crönert *Mem.* p. ix. The derivative ἡ ἀλωνία occurs in BU 146 (ii/iii A.D.), BM III, p. 202 *bis* (iii/A.D.).

ἁμαρτάνω.—It will be convenient to give (non-Christian) citations for this important word fully. BU 846 (ii/A.D.) is an illiterate appeal from Antonius Longus to his mother Neilous, entreating her to be reconciled (and send him money?). He makes his daily prayer to Sarapis for her, etc., as usual. Λοιπὸν οἶδα τι[. . .] αἵμαντῷ παρέσχημαι παιπαίδευμαι, καθ’ ὃν δὲ τρόπον οἶδα, ὅτι ἡμάρτηκα: the sen-

tence as a whole can only be guessed, but the word we are concerned with is quite clear. In the interesting rescript of an Emperor to the Jews, Par P 68, we read καὶ γὰρ τ[οὺς εἰς ἡμᾶς] ἀμαρτάνοντας δε[όντως κολάζεσθαι] εἰκός. In OP 34 iii.⁹ (127 A.D.) a Roman prefect uses some strong language about infringement of his instructions about some archives: ἄδειαν ἑαυτοῖς ὧν ἀμαρτάνουσι ἔσεσθαι νομίζοντες—"imagining that they will not be punished for their illegal acts" (G. and H.). A few lines lower we read τοὺς παραβάντας καὶ τοὺς διὰ ἀπειθίαν καὶ ὥς ἀφορμὴν ζητοῦντας ἀμαρτημάτων τειμωρήσομαι, "any persons who violate it, whether from mere disobedience or to serve their own nefarious purposes, will receive condign punishment" (*ibid.*). The noun ἀμάρτημα likewise occurs in TbP 5 and Par P 63, cited above under ἀγνόημα. In an inscription of Cyzicus territory (*JHS* xxvii. (1907) 63), which F. W. Hasluck supposes to belong to iii/B.C., we find ἀμαρτίαν μετανόει, and the word is also found in the interesting *Syll.* 633, which illustrates so many N.T. words, δς ἂν [*sic leg.*] δὲ πολυπραγμονήσῃ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ περιεργάσῃται, ἀμαρτίαν ὀφιλέτω Μηνὶ Τυράννῳ, ἣν οὐ μὴ δύνηται ἐξειλάσασθαι. See also LpP 119 (274 A.D.) . . . τ]ῶν ἀμαρτιῶ[ν] τὰς πονηρίας συνεχῶ[ς ἀ]νορθουμένων. The adj. ἀμαρτωλός appears in an inscription of iii/B.C., *OGIS* 55³⁰: ἐὰν δὲ μὴ συντελῇ ὁ ἄρχων καὶ οἱ πολῖται τὴν θυσίαν κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, ἀμαρτωλοὶ ἔστωσαν θεῶν πάντων, "sinners against all the gods." The word is noted by Grimm as occurring "very seldom in Greek writers": he quotes Aristotle and Plutarch. These, however, with the inscription, sufficiently demonstrate the "profane" use of the term.

ἀμάω.—The word is almost entirely poetical in earlier Greek, though found in Herodotus. Plutarch has it, and HbP 47, an uneducated letter of 256 B.C., which vindicates its place in the vernacular.

ἀμελέω.—A common vernacular word, with infin. GH 38

(i/B.C.) *al.*, absolute TbP 37 (*ibid.*) and very frequently ; with gen. OP 113¹⁶ (ii/A.D.), and even dat. in the illiterate Par P 18.

ἄμεμπτος.—In the marriage contracts CPR 24 and 27 (136 and 190 A.D.) we have αὐτῆς δὲ Ἀ. ἀκατηγόρητον ἐαυτὴν [παρεχομένης ἐν τ]ῇ συμβιώσει, and αὐτῆς δὲ τῆς Θ. ἄμεμπτον καὶ ἀκατηγόρητον παρεχομένης. OGIS 443⁹ (i/B.C.) has τὴν τῶν . . . νεανίσκων ἐνδημίαν εὐτ[ακτ]ον π[αρέχεται καὶ ἄμεμπ]τον—Dittenberger's supplement is at any rate plausible. OGIS 485 was cited above under *ἀγνός*. For the adverb add BM III. p. 134, OP 473, 496, 724, 729 (all ii/A.D.).

ἀμέριμνος.—BU 372 ii.¹⁶ (ii/A.D.) let them come down ἀ[μέ]ριμνοι : *ibid.* 417 (ii/iii A.D.) ἵνα ἤδη ποτὲ ἀ. γένη. AP 136 (iii/A.D.) has both [ἀμ]ε[ρί]μνωσ and the derived verb ἀμεριμνῶ, in the sense "free from anxiety." FP 117 (108 A.D.), ἐκτίναξον τὸ διεῖρον (?) εἶνα ἀμέριμνος ἦς, is the same ; in 130 (iii/A.D.) we have a derived adj. ἀμεριμνικὸν governing the objective gen. ἐμοῦ. LpP 105²⁰ (i/ii A.D.) has ἵνα μέντοι ἀμεριμνότερον ἔχης, γράφω σοι. *Ibid.* 110¹⁴ (iii/iv A.D.) ἵνα ἀμέριμνος ὦμε (= ὦμαι, a middle form). Ἀμεριμνία also occurs in an almost unintelligible sentence at the beginning of OP 34 (early ii/A.D.). It will be seen that the N.T. meaning alone is attested from the vernacular documents.

ἀμετάθετος.—In OGIS 331⁵⁸ (ii/B.C.) King Attalus II of Pergamon, writing to the Pergamenes, orders his rescript to be placed in the temples ὅπως ἂν εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον ἀκίνητα καὶ ἀμετάθετα μένηι . . . OGIS 335 (ii/i B.C.), an Aeolic inscription, has τὰ δὲ κρίθεντα ὑ]πάρξοισι κύρια κ ἰ ἀμετάθετα. OP 75 (129 A.D.) ἐφ' ἣ [sc. διαθήκη] ἀμεταθέτω ἀμφότεροι ἐτελεύτησαν, and 482 (109 A.D.) διαθήκη, ἐφ' ἣ καὶ ἀμεταθέτω ἐτελεύτα ("which will was unchanged at his death," edd.), show that the word was used as a technical term in connexion with wills. The connotation adds considerably to the force of Hebrews vi. 17 f.

ἀμετανόητος.—LpP 26 is late (beginning of iv/A.D.), but *ὁμολογοῦμεν [έκο]υσία καὶ αὐθαιρέτῳ καὶ ἀμετανοήτῳ γνώμῃ* seems to be a legal formula, such as would presumably suffer little change with time. Its active force agrees with that in Romans ii. 5. But in GH 68, 70 (iii/A.D.)—duplicate deeds of gift—*ὁμολογῶ χαρίζεσθαι σοι χάριτι ἀναφαιρέτῳ καὶ ἀμετανοήτῳ . . . μέρος τέταρτον κτλ*, there is a passive sense, “not affected by change of mind,” like *ἀμεταμέλητος* in Romans xi. 29. So BM III. p. 166 (212 A.D.) *κυρίως καὶ ἀναφαιρέτως καὶ ἀμετανοήτως*.

ἄμμος.—PP II. 4 (iii/B.C.) *ὥστε ἀνακαθᾶραι τὴν ἄμμον*, TbP 342 (late ii/A.D.) *εἰς ἐκσκάφην . . . ἄμμον*. Ostr. 1237 (Ptol.) *τῆς ἄμμον*. Syll. 587^{109.197} (iv/B.C.) *αἱ*.

ἄμνός.—Syll. 615⁹ (iii/A.D.) *ἄμνός λευκός ἐνόρχης*. Herwerden (s.v. ἀρήν) quotes an inscription from Cos, IC 40⁸ *ἄμνὰν καὶ ἄμνόν*.

ἄμπελος.—Another nom. fem. in -ος amply vouched for in the papyri, e.g. PP I. 29 (iii/B.C.) *τὴν ἄμπελον*. The compound *ἄμπελουργός* is found Syll. 535¹⁷ (ii/B.C.). A collective use of ἄ. may be seen in Witk. 23 (PP I. 29—iii/B.C.) *τὴν ἄμπελον πεφυτευμένην*. BM III. 134 (ii/iii. A.D.) *ἦσαν ἐν ἀμπέλῳ*, “planted with vines.” PFi 50 (iii/A.D.) *ad initt. ἐξ ἴσου τῇ[ς ἀμπέ]λου μεριζομένης*.

ἄμπελόν.—Nothing earlier than Diodorus in “profane” Greek is cited for this word by Grimm. It occurs in five documents of TbP (vol. i.), three of them ii/B.C. and two a little later. Its appearance in HbP 151 (about 250 B.C.) is presumably coeval with the LXX; nor does the language (. . . *μὴ παραγίνεσθαι . . . τρυγήσοντα τὸν ἄμπελῶνα*, from a fragment of a letter) suggest that the word was new. It occurs indeed frequently in RL, a few years older still.

ἀμύνω.—Syll. 356³⁵ (rescript of Augustus) *καὶ [ὅτε ἡ]μύνοντο*.

ἀμφιέννυμι.—Syll. 197²⁴ (iii/B.C.) *ἀμφιέσας καὶ ἐφόδια*

δούς. In *OGIS* 200²⁴ (iv/A.D.) we find ἀμφιάσαντες, a form, according to the editor, by no means rare in the Roman period. So Luke xii. 28.

ἄμφοδον.—This word is quoted by L. and S. from Aristophanes and Hyperides, in both cases only as cited by later writers. Its appearance in Mark and the δ-text of Acts (xix. 28 D, etc.) is in accord with its frequency in the papyri of the Roman age. G. and H. translate it “quarter,” *vicus*. A large number of these are named, and residents are registered in the ἀπογραφαί as ἀπ’ ἀμφόδου Ἀπολλωνίου Ἰερακίου and the like, or ἀπὸ Μακεδόνων, with ἀμφόδου omitted. Cf. *Syll.* 528, where Dittenberger defines ἄμφ. as “pars oppidi domibus inter se contingentibus exaedicata, quae undique viis circumdatur.”

ἄμωμος.—See Nägeli p. 25, and add the occurrence in a memorial inscription of ii/B.C. reproduced in *Archiv* i. p. 219 f.

ἀνά.—In the specimen pages of Radermacher’s forthcoming N.T. Grammar (in Lietzmann’s *Handbuch*) there are some good citations to dispose of Hebraism in the distributive ἀνά. For ἀνὰ μέσον many examples may be quoted from Ptolemaic and later papyri, and from Hellenistic inscriptions.

ἀναβαθμός.—*Syll.* 587³⁰⁸ (iv/B.C.) ἀναβαζμούς, apparently parts of a τροχιλεία, on which see Dittenberger’s note, p. 309.

ἀναβαίνω.—With ἀ. used of “going up” to Jerusalem, or the temple, cf. Par P 47 (ii/B.C.=Witk. p. 65) ὁ στρατηγὸς ἀναβαίν<ει> αὔριον εἰς τὸ Σαραπιῆν. Cf. also PP II. 9 (iii/B.C.) πλήρωμα ἀναβέβηκεν, “the gang has gone away”; Par P 49 (ii/B.C.=Witk. p. 47) ἐὰν ἀναβῶ καὶ γὰρ προσκυνῆσαι. BM III. p. 194.

ἀναβάλλω in something like the forensic sense, “defer” a case, occurs in TbP 22 (ii/B.C.) ἀναβαλλόμενος εἰς τὸν

φυλακίτην “referring the matter to the inspector” : cf. Par P 66 (i/B.C.) ὧν τὰ ἔργα ἀναβάλονται (i.e. -λλ-) “whose work is postponed.” Elsewhere it is generally=“cast up” or “send back” : in *Ostr.* 1154 (Rom.) ἀναβαλεῖν τὰ ἱμάτιά σου appears to be used of the “setting up” of a weaver’s woof. The noun ἀναβολή has a large variety of meanings. Thus AP 34 (ii/B.C.) ἐκθεῖναι τὴν κατάστασιν εἰς μηδεμίαν ἀναβολὴν (“without delay”) ποησαμένους. (Cf. *Syll.* 425²² (iii/B.C.) ἀ. λαβόντες ἔτη τρία.) In OP 729 and ChP 15⁹ (ii/ and iv/A.D. respectively) the same phrase as in Acts xxv. 17 occurs (*plus* the article) in a wholly different sense, “to make an embankment” : cf. BU 513 (ii/A.D.), 362 (iii/A.D.), BM III. p. 179 (i/B.C.). But in AP 91¹¹ (ii/A.D.) ἀναβολὰς διωρύγων is rendered by the edd. “dredging of canals.” Further, in a legal document PP III. 21 (iii/B.C.) we have τῆς ἀναβολῆς τοῦ ἱματίου with hiatus before and after, so that we cannot certainly join the words. Add *Syll.* 514⁵² (ii/i B.C.) and 587¹⁸⁵ (iv/B.C.), *Ostr.* 1567.

ἀναβλέπω.—*Syll.* 807¹⁷ (ii/A.D.) of a blind man recovering sight in the temple of Asclepios.

ἀνάγαιον.—This form of the word is supported by κατάγειον OP 75 (129 A.D.), καταγαίω BM III. p. 160⁸ (212 A.D.), Rein P 43 κατάκεον (102 A.D., illit.) Τῶν ἀνωγαίων occurs at the end of vi/A.D., Par P 21³.

ἀναγγέλλω, which in Hellenistic Greek is found much in the sense of the Attic ἀπαγγέλλω, is illustrated by PP III. 42 (iii/B.C.) τὰ γεγενημέ]να σοι ἐμοὶ ἀνήγγελλον, *ibid.* 56 (Ptol.) ἀναγγέλειν σοι αὐθέμερον : cf. *Syll.* 263⁷ (c. 200 B.C.) ἐντέταλμαι αὐτῷ ἀναγγεῖλαι ὑμῖν ἃ ἡβουλόμην ὑμᾶς εἰδῆσαι. See Witkowski’s note, p. 5.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

OPERA FORIS:
MATERIALS FOR THE PREACHER.

II.

PSALM cix. 21-22 :—

But do (or rather, work) thou, O God the Lord, for thy name's sake :

Because Thy mercy (or rather, lovingkindness) is good, deliver thou me.

For I am poor and needy,

And my heart is wounded within me.

I am gone like the shadow when it declineth :

I am tossed up and down as the locust.

The Psalmist has exhausted himself in calling down curses upon his thankless and faithless opponents. He now sinks back upon the thought of his own pitiful condition, and appeals to God for help. He is downhearted and depressed at the power of an evil world over his life, and this conception is brought out by a double metaphor. When the light of the sun is waning, the shadow lengthens upon the sand, soon to disappear altogether with the radiance on which its very existence depends. I am like that shadow, the Psalmist pleads ; I have to fade and pass away ; the forces of the outside world are too powerful for me. Also, I am whirled to and fro, like the locusts, at the mercy of gusts of passion and malice blown from strong opponents ; my life does not seem to lie within my own control.

Dr. Briggs, in his recent edition of the *Psalter* (vol. ii. 368) emends the locusts out of this passage, on the ground that they are abrupt and inappropriate. "There is no suggestion of a storm in the context." Yet, even though we might argue that no storm is meant, but only a strong wind, which might naturally spring up in the late afternoon or early evening, it is better not to tie down a Semitic poet

to uniformity of metaphor. Besides, as it happens, a recent traveller has described an experience of his own, one afternoon about five or six o'clock, at Tiberias, which exactly illustrates the Psalmist's language. In his posthumous volume, *Tent and Testament* (p. 123), Mr. Herbert Rix tells how he there witnessed "a yellow snow-storm" of locusts, drifting up between the mountains. "The westward drift of the swarm continued for an hour, then all of a sudden a sort of miracle seemed to occur. The wind quite suddenly changed to the exactly opposite quarter. In a moment heat was changed to coolness, and in a moment the flight of the locusts was checked. For a time there was a confused mixing of the swarms, just as we see when snowflakes are whirled about by gusts. Then a steady drift in a contrary direction set in, and the whole flight was driven back to the wilderness by the way that it had come. It was difficult to realize, as we saw them thus at the mercy of every breath, that these particles were all alive. Their helpless drifting greatly impressed me." Afterwards Mr. Rix recollected this passage from the Psalter in which the Hebrew singer compared his bitter, helpless fate to the flight of these insects whirled before a strong wind.

The contrast to such apparently irresistible forces and passions, which sometimes seem to play fast and loose with human life, lies in God's will of goodness. *Do thou, work thou, for me*, whatever or whoever is against me. Faith seeks to rally its powers by casting itself on what it knows of the Lord's character and purpose in the Lord's world. Faith lies at His mercy, not at the mercy of accident or malice. The basis of this trust in God's revealed רַחֲמֵי (or loving-kindness), i.e. the loyal affection which the head or father of his family shows to his dependents, to whose interests he is devoted. This is one of God's characteristic qualities. It is reliable and supreme, *good* activity exercised on

behalf of His creatures and children. Others¹ may forget or decline to show mercy (verse 16); God never does.

The immediate reference of the stanza is to the helpless condition of people whose happiness and fortunes seem now and then at the mercy of unchecked injustice and oppression from their fellow-men, and whose existence depends, for its precarious tenure, upon the unreliable favour of stronger people. But wider applications suggest themselves, e.g., the play of natural forces and factors, such as disease and temporal disaster, or, more widely still, the apparently uncontrolled power of death to have the human soul "blown about the desert dust." Against all such fears, born of its sense of dependence upon outside powers, the soul sets up its higher dependence upon the God who is bound to it in loving mercy.

* * * * *

Lamentations i. 12 : *Behold and see if there be any sorrow like unto my sorrow.*

The captive nation appeals for pity on her unparalleled distress. Budde, in his brief commentary (*Kurze Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament*, xvii. p. 82), prefers to rearrange the whole stanza, taking *Behold and see* with the words which immediately precede (*all ye who pass by*, you far-travelled observers, who have seen many tragedies), but the general sense is unaffected. In the first anguish of her grief, the exiled nation feels that nothing like this calamity has ever occurred among men. Surely it is unexampled, unprecedented. Such is the instinctive feeling, especially of the young, when distress overtakes them for the first time; they exaggerate the size of their mishap, since they

¹ Mercy or lovingkindness, in this sense, was the bond between members of the community, a loyal helpfulness, which formed part of the community's relation to its God and was bound up with His relationship to them. Compare the statement of this by Professor Robertson Smith in his *Prophets of Israel* (pp. 160 f.).

have not enough experience of life to see it in its true proportions. No one, they cry, can ever have suffered as we have. The pathos is intelligible, but it is not quite reasonable. The cry is natural, but it has to be modified in the light of wider observation.

A similar phase of feeling is represented in the Book of Job, where the individual rather than the nation is the subject. The theophany which concludes the book seems intended to correct the sufferer's attitude to his personal mis-haps. When God speaks out of the whirlwind, with a vast message of cosmic range, Job is really told, as Dr. Courtney puts it in his latest volume (*The Literary Man's Bible*, p. 42), "to look at the larger scheme of the universe. Every man in grief is naturally inclined to overrate the importance of his own personality. 'There is no suffering like my suffering,' he is apt to say; 'there is no such salient instance of the injustice of the world.' How can such a selfish attitude be cured? Only, the Book of Job would seem to suggest, by raising one's eyes to the hills, by thinking of the bigger things, by trying to understand an universal scheme in which the individual plays his part indeed, but a wholly subordinate and, perhaps, ineffective part." No Hebrew thinker would have admitted that the sufferer, whether as a nation or as an individual, whether punished for wrong-doing or tried by discipline, could play an ineffective part in God's plan; but otherwise the point of Dr. Courtney's interpretation is quite sound.¹

* * * * *

In his latest volume (*Die Quellen des Lukas-evangeliums*, 1907), Dr. Bernhard Weiss does not cater for the preacher but for the specialist in New Testament criticism. His pages are crowded with technical and minute discussions of the

¹ Compare Mr. Meredith's remark in *Evan Harrington* (chap. x.): "A misery beyond our own is a wholesome picture for youth." Mr. Chesterton has also some shrewd sentences in *Charles Dickens* (pp. 24-35) upon the "starless outlook common in the calamities of boyhood."

Third Gospel in its relation to the other two synoptic narratives. Now and then, however, his exegesis yields some results which are capable of a wider use. Thus, on Luke xii. 1 f., he has some acute remarks. The passage in question runs thus : *Meanwhile, when the crowd was gathering in its thousands, insomuch that they trod one upon another, he began to say to his disciples first of all.*

Beware ye of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy.

Nothing is covered up

That shall not be revealed,

Or hidden

That shall not be known.

Wherefore, whatsoever ye have spoken in the darkness

Shall be heard in the light ;

And what ye have whispered in the inner chambers

Shall be proclaimed upon the housetops.

The words follow an account of the Pharisees' attempt to ensnare Jesus, and Weiss's contention is that Jesus warns His disciples, not against the "simulatio" of the Pharisees, who "cloaked their real disposition under the appearance of extreme piety, but simply against 'dissimulatio' in the sense of Galatians ii. 13, i.e., the temper which would hide its true convictions owing to the fear of man." The man who practises *ὑπόκρισις* of any kind plays a part. He is insincere. But his motives may vary. The real self which is kept in the background may be worse or better than the open actions and words in which the man seeks to come before the public. In one case, *ὑπόκρισις* may be "the compliment paid by vice to goodness" ; the man may pretend to possess beliefs higher than his real ones. In another case, it may be toll paid needlessly and hurtfully by goodness to expediency and false prudence. The latter case, Weiss holds, was in the mind of Jesus when he uttered this warning. It was meant for disciples who may have felt that the powerful

authorities and large majority of the people were as yet unprepared to accept the new teaching, and who might consequently be tempted to dissemble some of their own convictions or to shrink from a fearless statement of the new faith. The words of Jesus meet this hesitancy by pointing out that all such covering up of principles is vain. Truth will out. The message cannot be always whispered ; it will demand active and open propaganda. But this advance into the open is not independent of men's courage and confession. Jesus does not mean merely that the full and frank statement of his gospel will come, in spite of any timid concealment of opinion upon the part of his disciples ; he implies that any such change will be brought about through their hearty co-operation, as they set aside temporizing and time-serving.

This responsibility of people for the advance of a cause in which they profess to be interested, is excellently argued, from a general point of view, by Mr. Morley in his volume upon *Compromise* (pp. 209-210). "When it is said that the various successive changes in thought and institution present and consummate themselves spontaneously, no one means by spontaneity that they come to pass independently of human effort and volition. On the contrary, this energy of the members of the society is one of the spontaneous elements. It is quite as indispensable as any other of them, if indeed it be not more so. . . . The world only grows better, even in the moderate degree in which it does grow better, because people will that it should, and take the right steps to make it better."

* * * * *

John i. 47 : *Jesus saw Nathanael coming to him, and saith of him, Behold an Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile.* Nathanael, as a genuine (ἀληθῶς) Israelite, free from prejudice, is contrasted with the majority of the Jews who were stubborn, suspicious, and distrustful of Jesus their Messiah

(cf. viii. 39–40). Nathanael's nature, it is implied, was unwarped. When Philip said, *Come and see*, he put aside his inherited prejudice and went with his friend to inquire. The absence of δόλος has been usually taken to suggest a contrast between him and Jacob or Israel, who caught at God's blessing by guile. Ἰσραηλῆτης at any rate, seems to convey some implicit allusion to the patriarch. But may it not be to his vision of God at Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 12 f.) to which there is an evident allusion in verse 51 (*Ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man*)? Dr. Abbott, in his *Johannine Grammar* (pp. 595–596), prefers indeed to connect the phrase with the vision at Peniel (Gen. xxxii. 30–31). “It was there that Jacob said, *I have seen God face to face*; and from this fact Philo, though erroneously, explains the name of ‘Israel,’ there given to Jacob, as *seeing God*.”¹ Probably both visions of God to “Israel” are blended in the thought of this passage. Nathanael, this ideal, straightforward, sincere disciple, is a better Jacob, and he has a better vision of God. To the writer's mind, he is evidently the type of all genuine disciples, for the address in verse 51 passes into the plural, indicating that a wider circle is in view. If the guile, from which he is declared to be free (cf. Ps. xxxii. 2), were extended to cover man's relations to his fellow-men as well as to God, an apt illustration might be found in John Wesley's remark: “I am this day thirty years old, and till this day I know not that I have met with one person of that age, except in my father's house, who did not use guile, more or less.”

JAMES MOFFATT.

¹ Dr. Abbott does not suggest, apparently, that this connexion was made by the writer of the Fourth Gospel or by Jesus. He simply adds, “Those who take this view would discern in the words addressed to Nathanael, i. 47, ‘Behold *an Israelite* indeed,’ the meaning, ‘Behold *one that sees God*,’ and would find an appropriateness between this and the following words” (in i. 50).

STUDIES IN THE PAULINE THEOLOGY.

I. THE EXPERIENCE OF PAUL.

(1) THE cry, Back to Christ, on many lips to-day expresses not only appreciation of Christ Himself, but also depreciation of Paul. It is often supposed that the simple gospel of Jesus has been obscured and perverted by the Apostle to the Gentiles. The historical function of Paul in delivering the Christian Church from its imminent danger of becoming merely a Jewish sect, and in forcing the door open for it to become a world-wide religion is ignored. For if his significance in this respect were fully recognized, it would be impossible to suppose that the man who secured for the gospel its widest extension was guilty of its most thorough perversion. It is at least probable that the mind that perceived most clearly the scope of the revelation of God in Christ conceived most fully its contents. As a study of the experience of Paul will show, he himself was conscious of his absolute dependence on, his intimate communion with, and his loyal submission to, his Living Lord; and, unless we are to judge him as self-deceived or as deceiving others, we must regard his life which was hid with Christ in God as a continuation of the ministry of Jesus. God was still revealing His Son in Paul. If this be so, and in these *Studies* the endeavour will be made to show that this is so, then the antithesis so commonly assumed between the teaching of Jesus and the doctrine of Paul is false;

and we are concerned only with different, but not contradictory modes of the same divine manifestation.

(2) It is with Paul's experience in Christ as the source and the warrant of his doctrine that we are primarily concerned; and in constantly relating his doctrine to his experience we are following the now generally approved method of investigation. The religious-historical method, which in Germany at least is being advocated as the only legitimate method in the inquiry regarding the nature of Christianity, insists that the fruits of religion in doctrine, worship, polity, should always be traced back to their root in the religious life itself. Religious psychology is now coming to be recognized as a necessary organon of theology. There is no reason for distrusting, but every reason for heartily welcoming this demand. Theology as the expression of religious life is invested with a personal interest in which it has too often been altogether lacking. The theology of Paul, conceived as the struggle and the victory of a soul, appeals to the imagination and the affections as it cannot when presented as an abstract system, divorced from an individual experience. This is not a reduction of his theology to subjectivity; for sin, sacrifice, and salvation are objective realities, and are subjectively realized as such in his experience. May we not even say that we do not possess any other record so full as his letters are of an experience so intense as his was; and accordingly nowhere else can we find a subjective realization of the objectivities of the Christian experience which can compare with his?

(3) While in dealing with the doctrines of Paul there will be constant reference to his experience, it seems desirable at the very beginning of the discussion to form as distinct a conception as possible of that experience as a whole. What the stages in his personal development were he has himself revealed to us in his letters. There are autobiographical

references scattered throughout his writings, which, brought together and wrought into a unity, present to us a living likeness. While it is possible that he may have sometimes used the first personal pronoun for rhetorical effect, yet many of the passages would lose their fullest meaning if we could not regard them as confessions of his own inmost life. The passages for which we can claim this distinctive character bring before us every stage of his personal development, and throw light on all the essential elements of his theology. The change which Christ wrought in him, and the growth in the knowledge, love, and service of Christ which he displayed afford one of the most striking evidences of the constant presence and prevailing power of Christ in his life. While it is not maintained that Paul's experience affords the only valid type of Christian life, yet that experience, interesting as it is as a "human document," does distinctly establish the conclusion, that this type, which reappears in Augustine, Luther, Wesley, must be adequately accounted for by any theology which can prove its title to the Christian name.

(4) While we gratefully recognize the service which Sir W. M. Ramsay is rendering in recovering for us the Gentile environment in which Paul's youth was spent, and in showing how much he was influenced in thought and feeling as well as in language by that environment; and while we gladly welcome the contribution of the late Professor Ernst Curtius to the same subject in the *EXPOSITOR* for November, 1907, yet there seems to be little doubt that here we should look in vain for the key that would unlock the inmost secret of Paul. His own testimony points in another direction. While he was proud that he was "a citizen of no mean city" (Acts xxi. 39), and that he was "a Roman born" (xxii. 28), yet it was in Jerusalem that he was "brought up, at the feet of Gamaliel, instructed according to the

strict manner of the law of the fathers, being zealous for God." His position may perhaps be illustrated by a modern analogy. It has been observed that the British living on the Continent are generally more aggressively patriotic than their countrymen at home are, and maintain many of the distinctive customs of the mother land most tenaciously; and yet when they return home they are surprised to discover that there has been some modification in their opinions and manners brought about by their surroundings abroad. While Paul was in his youth influenced by his Gentile environment, yet probably his attitude to it was resistant, and not responsive, and his Jewish piety and patriotism were made still more rigid and exclusive by his education in Jerusalem. After his conversion, when these fetters were broken and cast off, those wider sympathies and influences of his home in Tarsus again asserted themselves, but probably not till then. If in his vocation as the Apostle to the Gentiles he was affected by the thought and life in which he had shared in Tarsus, yet prior to his conversion we must regard him as a Jew of the narrowest type. It is surely his own actual condition as a Pharisee which he describes in his outburst against the Judaizers, who were threatening even a Church so dear and so devoted to him as that of the *Philippians*. "Though I myself might have confidence even in the flesh; if any man thinketh to have confidence in the flesh, I yet more; circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews; as touching the law a Pharisee; as touching zeal, persecuting the church; as touching the righteousness which is in the law found blameless" (iii. 4-6). This is no merely rhetorical argument; it is a vivid reminiscence and a frank confession. These things had once been gain to him, and to become a Christian he had to count them loss (verse 7). How ardent was his renunciation of this

spiritual condition is surely indicated in his vehement phrase, "I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dung" (verse 8). Such detestation implies a corresponding appreciation. He was a complete, consistent, and for a time at least a contented Pharisee. His treatment of the law both in Galatians and Romans betrays the Pharisaic standpoint. The burden, the bondage, and the curse of the law were not felt by the common people, but by the conscientious Pharisee. The dishonest Pharisee discovered and practised the arts of evasion, and thus succeeded in easing the yoke and lightening the burden of the law. He who honestly and seriously accepted the Pharisaic attitude to the law did labour and was heavy laden, and nevertheless could persuade himself that he was so wearing the yoke and carrying the burden as by his merits to secure God's favour. Paul could not have so vehemently opposed and confidently conquered the Judaizer had the battle not been previously fought to a finish in his own soul. While, as will afterward be shown, there is a permanent and universal element in Paul's conception of the law, yet that conception is distinctly coloured by his Pharisaic experience. We have no reason for believing that Jesus' denunciations of the hypocrisy of the Pharisees would have applied to Paul's character as a Pharisee; yet, on his own confession, the ceremonialism, formalism, legalism, and exclusiveness of Pharisaism were at one period at least characteristic of him. This fact is in no way to his discredit. However mistaken the Pharisaic point of view may now appear to us, it was generally regarded as the fairest flower and the ripest fruit of Judaism. Men of moral earnestness and religious seriousness were attracted and attached to it. The levity or the laxity of youth was never seen in Paul's life; but so far as our evidence carries us, from his earliest years morality and religion asserted their paramount claim on him.

(5) It was not from this condition, however, that Paul at once passed to Christian faith. There seems to have been a transition period, in which his Pharisaic content left him, and his own experiences presented a problem that Pharisaism could not solve. It seems to the writer that we are fully justified in assuming that the passage in Romans vii. 7-25 is an autobiographical reference. This conclusion is refused on two grounds : (i.) It is said that the first personal pronoun is here merely rhetorical, and that Paul is not here giving his personal experience, but is simply individualizing for literary effect the common Christian experience. But surely the form of the appeal to the common Christian experience in the sixth chapter disproves this. There too a question is asked, and answered in the same form of words. But in the former case Paul goes on to say, " We who died to sin, how shall we any longer live therein ? " (vi. 2), and in the latter, " Howbeit I had not known sin, except through the law." If the individualizing of the common Christian experience secures rhetorical effect, it surely sacrifices argumentative force. If Paul could say your experience as well as mine proves this, his argument would gain in cogency. To appeal to himself alone when he might have appealed to his readers as well would have shown greater feebleness in reasoning than we have any right to ascribe to him. (ii.) Further, it is assumed that it is a Christian experience which is appealed to, and the reason given is this, that the unregenerate man cannot in mind approve and in will desire the law of God ; but this is dogmatism ruthlessly trampling on experience, theory distorting fact. Paul before his conversion was a serious and earnest man morally and religiously. He had both a sensitive conscience and an honest purpose. He was seeking to serve God according to the light that he had. He does not in this passage claim for himself more than we should be prepared to assign to

many a man who has not yet tasted how gracious the Lord is. It was his religious belief and not his moral aim that needed to be changed. Even of his persecuting frenzy he says, "Though I was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious: howbeit I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief" (1 Timothy i. 13). It is evident that the rough-and-ready distinctions of regenerate and unregenerate do not apply to so complex a case. (iii.) The position of the passage in the argument of the Epistle is against this reference to Christian experience. Paul is expounding the Christian salvation, and his own distinctive gospel of salvation by God's free grace apart from the works of the law. He is meeting objections to his view. That the law cannot save from moral impotence, but Christ can, is surely a truth that refers to the unsaved and not the saved. It is not a description of Christian experience; but an argument for abandoning the fruitless way of the law, and entering on the fruitful path of faith. Is not Paul's distinctive view of Christian experience just this, that as he lives in the spirit, he is dead to the law? Yet here the law still holds dominion, and makes demands that cannot be fulfilled. For these reasons the writer holds that Paul is here describing his own experience before conversion.

(6) As such a description the passage deserves closer study. To the writer it seems that the more abstractly we explain any saying of Paul's, the more likely we are to miss its meaning, and the more concretely we interpret it, the nearer we shall get to his mind and heart. Accordingly, he believes that Paul is here describing not his experience generally, but a distinct inner event that had burned itself into his memory. Just as we may suppose that in Isaiah vi. the record of the prophet's call is coloured by subsequent experience, so it is possible that here Paul describes a crisis

in his own inner life as it appeared more clearly to him in the light of what he afterwards passed through. With this qualification we may, however, affirm that verse seven describes a moral discovery which he made either in one flash of moral insight, or in the brightening light of growing moral knowledge. So long as he thought of righteousness as external conformity to the law of God he remained a contented Pharisee, for he could confidently maintain that "as touching the righteousness which is in the law" he was "found blameless." But when it was brought home to him that the law was not confined to outward acts, but included inward dispositions, that one of the commandments forbade evil desire as well as action, then the battlefield of his moral life was changed. In the realm of action he had hitherto believed himself victorious; in the dominion of the inner life he found himself defeated. This extension of the scope of the law he could not but approve, even although it brought him self-condemnation instead of self-satisfaction.

(7) Two questions in this connexion press for an answer : (i.) Did Paul make this moral discovery independently without any external influence, or did the suggestion come to him from one of his teachers, or even indirectly from Jesus Himself ? Within Judaism itself the inwardness of religion and morality were in theory recognized, although in practice largely ignored. We need not then look beyond its borders for an outward source of this moral discovery. One cannot but ask, however, whether discussion in the Jewish schools, or at least among the serious and earnest young men who were disciples in these schools, was not stimulated by such teaching as Jesus gave in the Sermon on the Mount. It is an attractive idea that ultimately from Jesus Himself came the wound to the soul of Paul, which He and He alone was afterwards able to heal. (ii.) Does Paul refer to the prohibition of evil desire generally, or has he any definite

desire in his view ? The word *ἐπιθυμήσεις* "has a wider sense than our 'covet' ; it includes every kind of illicit desire " (Sanday and Headlam's *Romans*, p. 179). It is used by Jesus in regard to the lustful look (Matthew v. 28). In the tenth commandment there is the clause " thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife " (Exodus xx. 17). The repeated reference in this passage to the *flesh* would at first sight appear to lend some countenance to the supposition that it is some form of sensual desire to which Paul is here alluding. Dr. Bruce maintains that "*body* and *flesh*, so far as obstructing holiness is concerned, are for the Apostle synonymous terms." "He speaks in so serious a tone because he knows the formidable nature of the foe from *present, chronic* and *personal experience*. This we know from that extremely significant autobiographical hint in 1 Corinthians : ' I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage ; lest by any means, after having preached to others, I myself should become a rejected one ' (ix. 27). He found it necessary for spiritual safety to be in effect an ascetic, not in any superstitious sense, or on a rigid system, but in the plain practical sense of taking special pains to prevent the body with its clamorous passions from getting the upper hand." In defending this suggestion Dr. Bruce makes a statement, the truth of which we cannot challenge. "There is a mysterious, subtle, psychological connexion between spiritual and sensual excitements, which some of the noblest men have detected and confessed " (THE EXPOSITOR, Fourth Series, volume ix. pp. 190, 191). The characteristics of Paul's genius do lend probability to this view of the evil desire, which he found himself unable to quench. If, even after his conversion, such severe self-discipline was necessary, how hopeless must have appeared the struggle when no help seemed near. It is a condition of acute misery and even comfortless despair which is described in the cry, " O

wretched man that I am ! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death ? ” (Romans vii. 24).

(8) Although there is no distinct autobiographical reference to the next stage of his inner life, yet we do not appear to be indulging in baseless conjecture when we connect his persecuting frenzy with his moral despair. One may be excused the exercise of “ psychological divination.” There may be two links between the inward mood and the outward deed. (i.) Paul may have imagined that he could compensate for his failure in keeping the whole law by this display of devotion to it in the persecution of those who appeared to him violators of it in recognizing as Messiah one whose manner of death the law pronounced as accursed. An uneasy conscience has often been the motive of persecution. His madness against the Christians (Acts xxvi. 11) may have been the measure of the misery he experienced in himself ; nay even the frenzy of his wrath and hate against them may have eased a little the strain of the self-despair. Had he been a contented Pharisee, there is nothing in his disposition as revealed to us in his letters to explain the madness he himself confesses. He had begun to feel the goad, and in his ignorance and unbelief he was kicking against it (Acts xxvi. 14). Because his own heart was so ill at ease the joy and peace and hope their faith gave to those whom he was persecuting would still more exasperate him. How could they, the blasphemers, be so happy when he, the defender of the law, was so miserable ? (ii.) But another motive of his action may be conceived. Doubtless he as a pious and patriotic Jew was looking forward eagerly to the Messiah’s coming ; probably even he may have cherished the hope that the Messianic age might bring him individually some relief from his pain. How angry then he must have felt at the Christians who declared that the Messiah had come, and had been rejected by the people to save whom He had come,

and had even been put to the accursed death of the cross! The words quoted in Galatians iii. 13 from Deuteronomy xxi. 23, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree," were full of significance for Paul even before his conversion. For him the Christians appeared guilty of blasphemy of the deepest dye in maintaining that the Messiah had died under the curse of God. They must be forced themselves to pronounce accursed Him whom now they were proclaiming as the Messiah. "Punishing them oftentimes in all the synagogues, I strove to make them blaspheme" (Acts xxvi. 11). This is his own confession of his purpose in persecuting. At any cost the judgment of the law must be maintained. Is it possible that the doubt sometimes visited him, What if they were right after all? What if the chosen people in their blindness had themselves by inflicting such a death on their Messiah quenched their only hope? Could it be possible that God had fulfilled His promise, and that this was the result? If such doubt ever came to him, as he witnessed the joy of martyrdom in Stephen (Acts viii. 1), and others, he doubtless flung it from him with his vehement "God forbid." He was still kicking against the goad. If it were indeed true that Jesus had risen from the dead, then he may have admitted to himself that Jesus might be the Messiah, however difficult it would be to explain the manner of His death.

(9) There was some preparation for his conversion. He must at least have been in such a spiritual condition as would make it possible for him to accept the appearance of Christ to him on the way to Damascus as a convincing evidence that He was indeed the Messiah. Had there been no such preparation, there could not have been the immediate submission, "What shall I do, Lord?" (Acts xxii. 10). The issue between Paul and the Christians seems to have narrowed itself down to this—Had Jesus risen from the

dead? If he could be convinced of that, then he recognized that the Messiahship necessarily followed, as they so confidently affirmed. The recognition of this fact does not, however, make less surprising and wonderful the conversion itself; it does not cast any doubt on the objective reality of the appearance of Jesus as the necessary cause of the evident change in Paul. So incredible did the fact of the rising again of one who had died the accursed death appear to him, that only the overwhelming manifestation of the Living Lord Himself could overcome his unbelief. His own description of his conversion proves this, ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων ὡςπερ ἐκ τῷ ἑκτρώματι ὤφθη καὶ μοί (1 Corinthians xv. 8). The same word ὤφθη is used of this as of the previous appearances of Jesus, putting it on the same level of objectivity. The word ἑκτρώμα is chosen to express the suddenness, the violence, in short the abnormality of the change thus brought about in him. At this point his experience was not evolutionary but revolutionary. The mode of his conversion colours his conception of the Christian life as the absolute antithesis of the previous life. It is his own experience he generalizes in the statements, "Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature; the old things are passed away; behold they are become new" (2 Corinthians v. 17). "For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature (marg. creation)" (Galatians vi. 15). It is probable that the whole range and the full content of the change was not at once realized. The Messiahship of Jesus became a certainty to him, and this was the burden of his testimony in the synagogue at Damascus (Acts ix. 20, 22). In the first account of his conversion in Acts the divine intention that he should be the Apostle to the Gentiles is conveyed to Ananias. "He is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles and kings, and the children of Israel; for I will show him how many things

he must suffer for my name's sake " (ix. 15, 16). But to Paul Ananias defines his mission in the words, " that thou mayest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Ghost " (verse 17). His being filled with the Holy Ghost, " a holy enthusiasm," as Dr. Bartlet describes it (Century Bible, *Acts*, p. 386), was consequent on the certainty of Jesus' Resurrection and His Messiahship. In the account Paul gives of his conversion to the multitude in Jerusalem he ascribes to Ananias this speech: " The God of our fathers hath appointed thee to know His will, and to see the Righteous One, and to hear a voice from His mouth. For thou shalt be a witness for Him unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard " (xxii. 14, 15). In his speech before Agrippa he ascribes to the Living Lord Himself the command, " Arise, and stand upon thy feet ; for to this end have I appeared unto thee, to appoint thee a minister and a witness both of the things wherein thou hast seen Me, and of the things wherein I will appear unto thee ; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom I send thee, to open their eyes, that they may turn from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive remission of sins and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in Me " (xxvi. 16-18). This summary of his message and mission, even if it comes to us from the lips of Paul himself (the possibility of this being a free report by Luke cannot be excluded), is antedated. All psychological probability points in the direction of a gradual realization by the Apostle both of the work he had to do, and the faith he was to teach. He himself, in the previous account of his experience, places the command to go to the Gentiles as part of the speech of Christ to him when he was in a trance in the temple at Jerusalem (xxii. 21). The probability would appear to be that he began as a witness to the Jews of the Resurrection and the Messiahship

of Jesus, and that he was gradually led by outward events and inward experiences to the full disclosure both of his message and mission. In the narrative of the outward events after his conversion there is, however, a discrepancy between the record in Acts (ix. 19–25) and his own report in Galatians (i. 11–20), which makes it difficult for us to trace his inward development.

(10) The record in Acts would suggest this view. After his conversion Paul associated himself with the Christian community in Damascus, and for a time taught in the synagogue no other doctrine than was usually delivered by the Christian witnesses; but he pressed his argument against Jewish unbelief with such fervour and force as to provoke an antagonism which less fiery preachers escaped. As his life was threatened in Damascus, he fled from it to Jerusalem; there, after the suspicions against him had been allayed, he associated himself with the primitive Church, over which the apostles presided; he continued his preaching among the Greek-speaking Jews with the same result as at Damascus. Evidently there was something provocative either in the matter or the manner of his preaching which was not at least in equal degree characteristic of the other apostles. As has already been noted, according to his own account, it was a direct command of Christ to cease from his vain efforts among the Jews, and to depart to the Gentiles, which led to his leaving Jerusalem (Acts xxii. 18–21), a step which the author of Acts ascribes rather to the anxiety of the Christian community in Jerusalem for his safety. If we had only the record in Acts, we might conjecture that Paul used the opportunity of this visit to Jerusalem to acquaint himself with the words and works of Jesus and with the beliefs current in the primitive Church; that for a time at least he himself did not advance beyond this standpoint; that at last his own distinctive experience forced on

him a consciousness of difference and even alienation ; and that this stage of experience is alluded to in the words otherwise difficult to interpret, " Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh ; even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more " (2 Corinthians v. 16). It does not seem improbable that for a time Paul did not realize fully the communion of the Living Lord, and relied on such knowledge of Jesus as the Christian community preserved ; that in agreement with that community he at first thought of Jesus as the Jewish Messiah, and was content to bear witness to His resurrection as a proof of His Messiahship to Jews only. The abandonment of the knowledge of Christ after the flesh and the summons to the mission to the Gentiles would in that case stand in close connexion. The unbelief with which the Jews met his testimony would recall his own unbelief. The way in which that unbelief had been overcome in his own case would suggest that it was only the consciousness of the Living Lord that could save. The fact that the law by the curse which it pronounced on the death on the Cross had so long hindered his belief in Christ would shatter his attachment to the law. The importance that the Church in Jerusalem attached to the earthly life of Jesus and its devotion to the law would estrange Paul. As the Living Lord had by His manifestation of Himself sufficed for his conversion, and the law had been only a hindrance,—Paul's view both of the content and the scope of the gospel would thus gradually be changed. Such a view of his experience, psychologically probable, would be consistent with the report in Acts.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

(To be continued.)

*THE PRESENT STATE OF THE CONTROVERSY
OVER THE PLACE AND TIME OF THE
BIRTH OF CHRIST.¹*

I DARE say you know that the birth of Christ, as a historical event, is beset with perplexities and uncertainties : by this I do not mean that He was supernaturally conceived, and that the introduction of the supernatural into the record of history produces doubt as well as belief, and uncertainty as well as assurance : it would lie in the very nature of the case that supernatural events should provoke both doubt and faith, and those persons who have decided that the supernatural has no place amongst the credibilities of a properly told history will at once dismiss all occurrences of this kind from the account, no matter how violently they may tear the record in detaching what they have decided to be incredible from what is, or may be, credible. But even apart from the problems introduced by the assumption of a supernatural element into the story, the record itself is full of difficulty ; one has only to rapidly run over some of the points at which the critical faculty takes offence—for example, that the Gospel of Mark knows nothing about the incidents of the birth of Christ ; granted that the explanation lies in the fact that the writer did not begin his history with the life but with the public consecration of the life, we can only be surprised at his silence. Perhaps the same thing may have to be said of the Fourth Gospel, though here we are at a later date, and it is therefore less likely that the writer can have been altogether ignorant of the Christian belief, which lands us in a dilemma that either he did not know or purposely did not allude to the birth of Christ.

¹ A popular lecture delivered to the Leeds Federation of the Free Churches at Batley, Oct. 2, 1907.

Either alternative is difficult; and even if we suppose a third hypothesis, namely, that there are such references in the Fourth Gospel,¹ but that they are obscure or perhaps obscured, it is not easy to see why obscurity should have been so much in request. There was no such reticence or intentional veiling to be detected in the writers of the early part of the second century. But it is when we come to the other two Gospels that the difficulties begin to multiply and to thicken. Matthew and Luke both have Infancy sections, but it reduces a harmonist to the last stage of despair to try and reconcile them. They did not derive their accounts from St. Mark, for at this point Mark has nothing from which to draw; and if, as is now generally conceded, Matthew and Luke have a second source from which they draw common matter (that is, such common matter as is not traceable to the Marcan original), then this second source, which we commonly call Q, had no infancy section, nor indeed any section earlier historically than the beginning of Mark. So we have unexpectedly stumbled upon another authority of very great weight, whose testimony is to be added to the silence of Mark or perhaps of John. But then this is not all: the accounts in Matthew and Luke do not overlap, except in so far as to say that Christ was born in Bethlehem in the days of Herod. Even where they agree, as in that fact, they do not agree as to how Christ came to Bethlehem nor why He came to Nazareth. Matthew's account implies, at all events to the average reader, that Jesus was born in Bethlehem because His mother lived there, and that He went to Nazareth because political necessity advised it. Luke brings Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem from political necessity of another kind, viz., the obligations of a census, and takes the family back to Nazareth by the natural home-going of

¹ In this connexion special attention should be paid to the Western reading in John i. 13 ("Who was born, etc.").

travellers who have accomplished what they came for. It is, as you know, the fashion to superpose the two Evangelists, so that each shall fill up the deficiencies of the other, Matthew bringing his STAR and his WISE MEN, and his MASSACRE OF THE INNOCENTS, and his FLIGHT INTO EGYPT, and his ANGELIC MONITORS; and Luke supplying the CROWDED KHAN and the ASTONISHED SHEPHERDS, and the PRESENTATION IN THE TEMPLE, and the AGED MEN and WOMEN SAINTS, as well as the allusions to the CENSUS and the Roman Government. It is also commonly said that the variation in the two accounts is due to the fact that Matthew gives Joseph's account and Luke gives Mary's, and that thus we have the matter attested by the two people who should know most about it, practically the final first-hand evidence on either side. But it seems to escape those who reason in this way that they have got rid of the discrepancy between Matthew and Luke by substituting for it a much more difficult discrepancy, viz., a want of consentaneity between Joseph and Mary, neither of whom seems to know the mind of the other or the events through which they passed together. For you see that even if Joseph had hid things in his heart as Mary is said to have done, neither of them could have made a secret of the reason why they came to Bethlehem, nor could they have had any doubt whether they went to Egypt or not. So we are much worse off for the supposition that we have two accounts, one derived from Joseph and the other from Mary. But it is when we come to Luke's account, taken by itself without any complication from comparison with parallel writers, that the difficulties become most intense, and in order to get a clear view of the question we must see how these difficulties arise. Luke tells us that Christ was born in the days of Herod the Great, and so does Matthew, and on this point there is no divergent opinion worth recording. But Herod the Great was dead in B.C. 4, and

therefore Christ was born about six years before the Christian era. This is not a very serious difficulty : it only means that the earliest investigators into the date of Christ's birth made a miscalculation. We are not bound by their error ; and although it sounds odd, at first, to say that Christ was born several years before Christ, it is quite certain, and we need not trouble to correct the Anno Domini reckoning and upset all the chronology of the world. And neither Luke nor Matthew is to be held responsible for errors of early chronographers ; perhaps this year ought to be called the year of grace 1913, but we can't alter it now.

But now come to the real point upon which the objecting critics have fastened. We are told by Luke (ii. 1) that Augustus Caesar issued a decree for taking an enrolment or census of the whole world, that is, of the Roman world, and that in consequence of this decree all the population in the kingdom of Herod were ordered to their native places, that a census or valuation, whatever it was, might be taken by the local officials, much as it would be taken in the present day in Turkey. In consequence of this political exigency, Joseph and Mary removed (at all events for a time) from Nazareth to Bethlehem ; and then Luke tells us further that Quirinius was governor of Syria when this census was first made. Now you will easily find out, from the pages of Josephus, that Quirinius came to Syria in the year A.D. 6-7 with the express purpose of making a census or valuation, that is, more than ten years after the death of Herod the Great ; Quirinius was also charged with the duty of winding up the affairs of Archelaus, the son of Herod, of whom you read in Matthew, who had been banished to the city of Vienne in Gaul, on account of his malpractices in his government. Josephus often refers to this census-taking under Quirinius, because it was the cause of one of the great outbreaks of the Jews against the Roman power,

under the leadership of Judas of Galilee. Luke speaks of this Judas as making revolt in the days of the taxing, and it is certain that this was a national movement which led to results of the greatest historical importance, and ultimately caused the ruin of the Jewish state, for these revolters under Judas of Galilee, when Quirinius came, were not Passive Resisters; they used all the weapons of the revolutionist, down to the burning of the custom-houses, and actual battle with Roman forces. You will see the difficulty of the situation. If Quirinius makes the enrolment or taxing or census, or whatever we like to call it, in A.D. 6-7, and if Jesus Christ is born in B.C. 6 or thereabouts, we shall have Luke in conflict with Josephus, unless it can be shown that there was an earlier census than that which we read about in Josephus, and that Quirinius was twice governor of Syria, and made two censuses. And it has been commonly supposed that Luke has made a bad historical mistake in his dating of Quirinius and his census; in which case his reputation as a historian is seriously damaged, (Professor Ramsay would say that Luke is not to be trusted any further if he made such a bad mistake; I should not like to treat my friends in that way); and since he not only says there was a census, but makes that census the ground of the journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem, we should have doubts raised in our minds as to whether it is not a mistake to say that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, when Luke gives a false or an impossible reason for his being there.

So we have to ask ourselves the question whether it is possible that Luke and Josephus were both right. Can it be that there was an earlier census than the one spoken of by Josephus, and that this one was also made by Quirinius? At first sight it looks very improbable. The whole action of the revolters whom Josephus describes implies that this was the beginning of a taxation which they held

to be incompatible with their liberty and with national ideas. If there had been an earlier census, we should expect Josephus to have mentioned it at the proper point of history, and if Quirinius had been in the country before on an imperial errand of this kind, he would have alluded to it in his description of the last years of Herod's reign. Moreover, we have a natural and healthy scepticism when people get over the difficulties of a historical contradiction by saying that things happened twice. But at this point we have to check ourselves. We must not say that things cannot happen twice when it is in their nature to happen, not merely twice, but many times. A census is not like an ordinary historical event: it involves periodicity. Take, for example, the census in our own country; it comes every ten years. If I said that an event happened in a particular year which was the year of the census, and you found reason to believe that it occurred ten years earlier than the particular year which I mentioned, you would at least give me credit for its being a census-year. So the first question into which we must look is the possibility of a periodic census. At first sight it seems extremely unlikely: there is not a trace of it in the history of the Roman Empire, although St. Luke says the census was world-wide, and the situation (if the veracity of Luke is to be maintained) almost requires a periodic census. Perhaps the first direction in which light would be looked for by a historical investigator is in the so-called indiction, a cycle of fifteen years, which we constantly find used for dating Greek MSS.; thus we find it stated that "this MS. was finished" in such a year "from the creation of the world, and in the eighth year of the Indiction," i.e., the eighth year of a particular cycle of fifteen years. (Chronologists of an imaginative turn have even calculated the year of the Indiction in which the world was created, and have put the number at the opening of the book of

Genesis!) An examination of these dates and of the allusions to them makes it pretty clear that it has something to do with taxation, but that it does not go further back than the year 312 A.D., when Constantine the Great settled the administration of the Byzantine Empire. Any references to the Indiction which imply an earlier date than 312 A.D. are easily shown to be forgeries. This does not help us much, except as we begin to reflect that at least it gives us some idea of what a census period would be like under the Roman Empire. Beyond that we are in the dark and at a loss from what quarter to look for light. The fact is that history and literature do not tell the whole story of the common life of a people. Suppose, for example, that at some future date, when our newspapers and magazines have gone to dust in consequence of the bad paper on which they are printed, and when our existing political organizations have been seriously modified by the arrival of the New Zealander, we were faced with the question, Did they take a census in England in the twentieth century? and did they make periodic valuations of the property of the people? Well, the census does not occupy a very wide space in the literature of the country, and in some future period of existence we might be hard put to it to prove that in a previous state of being we had been counted or taxed. I do not remember, at this moment, an allusion to it, say, in Thackeray or in Dickens; Mrs. Bardell does not fill up a paper for Mr. Pickwick. Happily for us the history of the Ancient World is constantly having revivals from the unexpected accessions of fresh material. It may be clay tablets from Babylonia, or similar monuments from the ruined cities of the ancient Hittites; it may be rock-inscriptions or funeral monuments from every corner of the ancient world: but most and best of all, the finds are the buried papyri that have been exhumed from

the mounds of Egypt or dissected from the wrapping of mummies or taken out of the stuffed interiors of sacred crocodiles. But although we have from this last treasure trove a wealth of documentary evidence as to the common life of the people, their wills, their lawsuits, their private letters, their bills (paid and unpaid), their invitations to dinner and the like, we never thought that there might turn up census papers of the districts from which the documents were recovered, because we did not realize with sufficient clearness that there had been a census taken at recurrent periods, certainly in Egypt, and therefore, with high probability, in the adjoining province of Syria. Perhaps we may make the case clearer to ourselves by putting it in the following way. Justin Martyr, in appealing to the Roman Senate in defence of the Christian religion, tells them that they can verify his statements about the birth of Christ by looking up the census papers. Whether Justin had any special reason or information upon which he acted when expressing himself in this way is very doubtful ; it was probably a case of literary bluff ! but even bluff requires a background, and he was probably drawing upon common knowledge of Imperial administration when he said that the papers were preserved ; and if they were preserved at Rome, they were probably preserved in duplicate in the provincial registries, and that means (I know it will be a startling statement to some) that if papyrus had been able to withstand the climate of Syria as it has been able to live in the dry air and dry sand of Egypt, we should have had it well within the bounds of possibility that the actual census paper which Joseph filled up (supposing such to have existed) or the Government official filled up for him might be recovered. We are as near to definite knowledge as it is possible to be in a perishing world !

But you will ask me, have the census papers been found,

and do they throw light on the situation ? The answer is that a great many such papers have turned up, described by the word "Enrolment," exactly as in the Gospel of Luke, and officially dated ; and from the dates it is easy to see that they constitute a cycle of fourteen years. Just as in our own country, when the cycle of ten years is nearly run out, the Government pass a Census Bill and appoint enumerators, so in the various provinces of the Roman Empire, if we may judge from the state of things in the province of Egypt.

Now let us see what such a census paper would be like ; I will try and translate one for you :—

To Dorion the Governor, and to. . . . the royal scribe, and to Didymus . . . and to the local communal secretaries from Thermoutharion the daughter of Thoonis, with her gentleman lodger Apollonius the son of Sotades. There are in my house on S. Lane St., Apollonius, the son of Sotades, and myself Thermoutharion, a freedwoman of the aforesaid Sotades. I am about sixty-five years old, of moderate stature, a honey-coloured complexion, a big face, and have a scar on my right knee.

And I, Thermoutharion, the afore-written, along with the same gentleman Apollonius, swear by the Emperor Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus that I have well and truly delivered the present list of those who live with me, and there is no other person living with me beyond the aforesaid persons, no foreigner, no Alexandrian, no freedman, no Roman, no Egyptian. If my oath is true, or the contrary, so help me God.¹

Given in the ninth' year of Claudius Caesar, etc., in the Egyptian month Phaophi.

¹ I have used some slight freedom in making a popular rendering.

You see the lady is a householder, and the householder makes the census return, as with ourselves. The date is the month of October A.D. 48; and it belongs to a row of other documents which run in a cycle of fourteen years. Count back fourteen three times and you will come to the year A.D. 6, which is pretty conclusive for the census spoken of by Josephus. Count back another fourteen, and you will probably come to the birth of Christ. Count back another fourteen, and you may perhaps come to the first establishment of the census by Augustus, for the year 23 B.C. is the year of his great administrative reforms.

Perhaps it will be sufficient to say that we have documentary evidence for A.D. 20, none for A.D. 34, then again for A.D. 48, and for the years A.D. 90, 104, 118, 132, and so on. Possibly some of the gaps may be filled without my knowledge, but there seems no doubt about the fourteen-year cycle, and Mr. Grenfell gives us a very good reason for it. A boy became taxable at the age of fourteen; so if he was born before a given census they would be sure to catch him at the next census, otherwise he might behave like the young people who travel without proper railway tickets, because they are under twelve.

Now all of this seems to me very wonderful and very eye-opening. But now let us return to St. Luke. The difficulty about the taxation of Joseph's family having disappeared, there remains the difficulty of taking people to their own towns for registration, a very awkward, and, one would have supposed, a very unnecessary proceeding. I can quite understand that people would be sceptical; moreover, if you look at the Egyptian document which I read to you, you will see that the landlady protests there are no other people there, Alexandrians, Romans or Egyptians, which looks as though they might have been there, and does not lend itself to the supposition that they

had all been ordered away. They certainly could not order the Romans to go home. So perhaps you will feel, as others have done, a difficulty at this point; for myself I do not share it. My experiences in the East, under the Turkish Empire, which in many ways is governed like the Roman Empire, have taught me that a man can be sent home on very slight provocation. 'Has he got his certificate of travel?' 'Then send him home to get one,' and so on in other cases. So I have not stuck at the journey to Bethlehem as though it were impossible, as some people have done; but in any case the difficulty can be got rid of by observing what took place in Egypt. We have a fresh piece of evidence of the highest value in the new volume of British Museum papyri. It is a document issued in anticipation of the census in the seventh year of Trajan (i.e., A.D. 103-4, the seventh census after the one described by Josephus). In it the prefect requires all persons who may be residing away from their own districts (called *Nomes* in Egypt, but I cannot say their *own nomes*) to return at once, in view of the approaching census. Here is a bit of the document—

Gaius Vibius Maximus, Prefect of Egypt. Since the time is come for the house to house enrolment, it is necessary for all absentees on any ground whatever from their own districts to return to their own hearths, that they may both carry out the regular order of the enrolment and that they may also be able to attend to the cultivation of their allotments, etc., etc.

We could hardly have anything more illuminating than such a document as this. If the Prefect of Egypt made an order for people to return to their homes in anticipation of the census in the year A.D. 104, there is clearly nothing impossible in such a decree having been issued in Palestine, say in B.C. 7. There still remains a number of difficulties in connexion with Quirinius, and the possibility of his having made an earlier census for King Herod the Great;

but the difficulties as to the fact of the census have been removed and, in part, the difficulties as to the birth in Bethlehem.

Mr. Kenyon, of the British Museum, was the first investigator of this matter of the enrolment, and to him belongs the honour of the discovery of the census period. His observations, confirmed by those of two Continental scholars, were promptly seized by Professor Ramsay for a most vigorous defence of the trustworthiness of St. Luke in his book, *Was Christ born in Bethlehem?* While I should not like to express too close an agreement with Ramsay in that matter, and regard his judgement of St. Luke as altogether too flattering, it would be a worse error of judgment not to admit that by his researches into the value of the Lucan tradition he has accomplished more for the rehabilitation of the Christian documents than half a century of apologists.

Perhaps you will see the bearing of these researches if, after the event, you turn back and see what used to be said on the subject by the great critics before these investigations in Egypt had brought the new facts to light. Suppose we turn to Strauss and his great work "The Life of Jesus," a book which, however antagonistic it seemed to Christian beliefs, was a landmark in the history of progressive thought, a very learned work and full of just criticisms and acute observations. "The first difficulty is that the ἀπογραφή (namely the inscription of the name and amount of property in order to facilitate the taxation) commanded by Augustus is extended to *all the world* (πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην). This expression, in its common acceptation at that time, would denote the *orbis Romanus*. But ancient authors speak of no such general census decreed by Augustus; they speak only of the assessment of single provinces decreed at different times. . . . It is said, Augustus at all events attempted an equal assessment of the Empire by means

of an universal census : and he began the carrying out of his project by an assessment of individual provinces, but he left the further execution and completion to his successors. Admit that the Gospel term *δῶγμα* (decree) may be interpreted as a mere design, or, as Hoffmann thinks, an undetermined project expressed in an imperial decree, still the fulfilment of this project in Judaea at the time of the birth of Jesus was impossible."¹ (It would be a moderate criticism of these statements to say that they are too strong.) He goes on to explain why Augustus would not have made a census of Palestine while Herod the Great was still ruling.

P. 154. "That Quirinius undertook a census of Judaea we know certainly from Josephus, who, however, remarks that he was sent to execute this measure . . . about ten years after the time at which, according to Matthew and Luke, Jesus must have been born."

P. 155. "As little is to be admitted that some preliminary measure, in which Quirinius was not employed . . . took place during the lifetime of Herod, in reference to the census subsequently made by Quirinius, and that this preliminary step and the census were afterwards comprised under the same name. In order, in some degree, to account for this appellation, Quirinius is said to have been sent into Judaea in Herod's time, as an extraordinary Tax-Commissioner,² but this interpretation of the word *ἡγεμονεύωντος* is rendered impossible by the addition of the word *Συρίας*, in combination with which the expression can denote only the Praeses Syriae."

These objections have still to be faced.

On the same page (155) will be found a stronger statement of Luke's incapacity. "He deals in manifest contra-

¹ Strauss, *Leben Jesu*. (George Eliot's translation, 4th ed. pp. 152, 153.)

² If I understand the matter, the hypothesis here rejected is what Professor Ramsay now defends.

dictions, or rather he has an exceedingly sorry acquaintance with the political relations of that period, for he extends the census not only to the whole of Palestine, but also (which we must not forget) to the whole Roman world." "To get a census extending to Galilee, he must have imagined the kingdom to have continued undivided as in the time of Herod the Great." (The criticisms upon Luke's capacity as an historian and upon his acquaintance with political events begin to look ridiculous.) Strauss then goes on to explain how it was that Luke came to refer to the census when no such census occurred at the birth of Christ. It was due to the fact that he had to establish the birth in Bethlehem, which was required on other grounds.

P. 156. "As he set out with the supposition that the habitual abode of the parents of Jesus was Nazareth, so he sought after a lever which should set them in motion towards Bethlehem at the time of the birth of Jesus. Far and wide nothing presented itself but the celebrated census: he seized it the more unhesitatingly because the obscurity of his own views of the historical relations of that time veiled from him the many difficulties connected with such a combination."

Again, on p. 159: "Luke, with the help of the census, transported the parents of Jesus from Nazareth to Bethlehem. Now we know what is the fact respecting the census: it crumbles away inevitably before criticism, and with it the datum built entirely upon it that Jesus was born in a manger—for had not the parents of Jesus been strangers? etc." It would be more correct to have said that the adverse criticisms on Luke would "crumble away."

And now let us see what was said by another famous critic of the Gospel narrative, M.^r Renan. He tells us frankly that Jesus was born at Nazareth, a little town in Galilee, which had no celebrity before this day. And

he explains the Bethlehem legend, and the associated marvels, by the exigencies of a Messianic situation, and the requirements of prophecy. Thus, in speaking of the enrolment under Quirinius, he says: "It is at least ten years later than the time Jesus must have been born, according to Matthew and Luke, for the two Evangelists make Jesus to be born under the reign of Herod, but the enrolment under Quirinius did not take place until after the deposition of Archelaus, i.e., ten years after the death of Herod in the thirty-seventh year of the era of Actium. The inscription by which they used formerly to pretend that Quirinius made two enrolments is recognized to be a fabrication. Quirinius may have been twice legate of Syria, but the enrolment only occurred at his second legation. In any case it would have been only applied to the districts already reduced to Roman provinces and not to kingdoms and to tetrarchies, especially while Herod the Great was still alive. . . . The journey of the family of Jesus to Bethlehem has no historical element . . . Jesus was not of the family of David. If he had been, one could not imagine that his family would have been forced, by an official and financial operation, to go and register themselves in a place from which their ancestors had sprung a thousand years before."¹

The important points in the foregoing are the concession that Quirinius may have been governor of Syria twice (which is one of the points, however, that remain to be established), and the objection (which has now lost almost all its force) that the enrolment could only have occurred at the second legation. Without going further into the history of this much debated question, on which every one who writes on the life of Christ must say something, we can see the direction in which the solution of the problem

¹ Renan, *Vie de Jésus*, c. 2.

is tending, and what points yet remain to be cleared up. A fresh inscription, belonging to the period under discussion, or a fragment of official correspondence on Egyptian papyrus, might very well settle the points that are still in debate one way or the other. As far as we have gone, the evidence is running very strongly in favour of the belief that Luke has given us a correct historical background for his Gospel.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

THE NEW SCHÜRER.

It is twenty-two years since the English translation of Schürer's monumental *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* was published in Clark's Foreign Theological Library. Much water has flowed under the bridges since then ; even since the issue of the third German edition in 1898, inscriptions, manuscripts, and papyri, have come in like a flood upon the historian. Fresh points of view have been urged by specialists in the internal and the external history of the period, and Dr. Schürer, with painstaking thoroughness, has not been slow to chronicle and estimate such contributions. The result is that we have now before us a fourth edition of the second volume (Leipzig, 1907, pp. 680), dealing with the internal conditions of the period. This covers §§ 22–30, which in the original English edition occupy the whole of volume i. and the first 218 pages of volume ii. (Division ii.). For the benefit of those who possess the latter, as well as for the sake of surveying some of Schürer's mature judgments upon the problems in question, it may be useful to notice a few of the more salient changes, in the way of addition or of alteration, which the learned author has introduced. These are usually

incorporated in the footnotes, but now and then the text has been modified or corrected.

Naturally, some of the most significant changes occur in the social and geographical sections (§§ 22–23), which are crammed with minutiae and references to recent literature upon the spread of Hellenism within the confines of Palestine. From Schürer's wealth of detail, it is serviceable to turn to Wendland's fine summary (pp. 103 f.) in his recent essay on *Die Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum* (1907). On two special points the English reader may also supplement Schürer by a reference to Mr. Herbert Rix's volume *Tent and Testament* (1907), where the bright, popular descriptions of the theatres at Gadara (pp. 134 f.) and of the site of Pella¹ (pp. 146 f.) fill out the concise statements of the German scholar on pp. 51 and 176.

It is more interesting, however, to notice the general estimate of the inner condition of the Jews, upon which the external arguments converge. Here Dr. Schürer shows least sign of having abandoned or even altered, to any material degree, his former judgment. Thus upon one crucial point he remains evidently impenitent. Objection has been taken to his statements upon the laws of cleanness and uncleanness, by several writers, including Mr. C. J. Montefiore (*Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 477 f.) and Dr. A. Büchler (*Der galiläische 'Am-ha 'Ares des zweiten Jahrhunderts*, 1906, pp. 126 f.), who contend that the picture drawn of average Jewish piety is exaggerated in colour and outline. These critics do not deny the complicated scheme of the ceremonial ordinances, with their tendency to externalism

¹ Mr. Rix explains that, so far from being a retired and obscure place, Pella was situated on a principal trade-route. "Even to-day" the Decapolis, instead of being uncivilized or provincial, "exhibits the most remarkable remains of Greek civilization which Palestine can show."

and anxious formalism. But they enter a *caveat* against any sweeping inferences from this feature. They maintain that no layman was bound to keep these ordinances, which applied to the priests alone. Furthermore, it is argued by Büchler that they cannot be shown to have operated in Judaea during the lifetime of Jesus. Schürer, so far as I have observed, does not allude to Mr. Montefiore,¹ but he sees as little in Büchler's view to-day, as he did last year when he reviewed that author's essay in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* (1906, 619-620). The tractate Kelim, as he showed then, fails to support any such distinction between the priests and the laity, nor does the consensus of Jewish commentators side with Büchler. Thus the severe verdict upon such trivial enactments which the Gospels put into the lips of Jesus (Matt. xv. 2; Mark vii. 2f.; Luke xi. 38-39) is pronounced by Dr. Schürer to be historically valid (pp. 560-565, Eng. tr. 106-111). It is significant that even Mr. Montefiore, while pleading that "these distinctions and rules did not concern the layman, and are themselves merely the written precipitate of the discussions of the schools, and were probably unknown to nine-tenths of the pious and observant Israelites in the age of Christ," at once adds that "the existence of a large priesthood who were bound to follow out the rules of clean and unclean to the utmost of their knowledge and capacity, and the existence of an extreme section of Rabbis who even sought to outdo these professional observers, were grave evils. These puerile prescriptions not only interfered with social intercourse, but tended to set up a false ideal of external sanctity."

On the question of prayer, Dr. Schürer remains equally unmoved (pp. 569-572, Eng. tr. 115-118) by the protest

¹ Not here, at any rate. But on pp. 468-471 he rejects the English scholar's view that Chaberim and Peruschim are not the same.

of Mr. Montefiore (*op. cit.* pp. 505 f.). The latter takes sharp exception to the statement that Judaism, in the age of Jesus, had already begun to deaden piety by confining prayer within the fetters of a rigid mechanism, treating it often casuistically and formally. Some proofs for this statement are certainly taken from prominent rabbis of the primitive age. One must grant so much to Schürer. But is it quite fair to infer from them more than a tendency? Popular piety is surely often superior to the professional or theological theories of its practice, and Dr. Schürer here seems scarcely sympathetic enough. It is generally hazardous to infer the actual state of contemporary religion from documents, and a due allowance for this fact would probably tend to modify the somewhat unbalanced conclusions which the Jewish scholar properly resents.

A similar lack of flexibility is to be felt in the well-known characterization of Jewish piety as eudæmonistic and utilitarian (pp. 547 f.), which remains unaltered from the earlier editions (Eng. tr. ii. p. 93), in spite again of Mr. Montefiore's argument to the contrary (*op. cit.* pp. 532 f.), and of Mr. Schechter's exposition (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1894-1897).

At the same time it is doubtful if any reasonable concession or qualification on this line would invalidate the trustworthiness of what the synoptic Gospels describe with regard to the piety and practice of the scribes and Pharisees in the time of Jesus. One signal merit of Schürer's work is that it corroborates from the historical side the leading features of that description; if the German scholar's arguments might have been put occasionally with less rigour,¹ they are nevertheless superior in insight to the opposite view, urged in these latter days by Jewish writers like Rabbi

¹ Dr. Allan Menzies has indicated this in a brief article in the *Hibbert Journal* (vol. i. pp. 789-792), replying to Mr. Montefiore's previous complaint (*ibid.*, 335-346) about the silence of Christian scholars upon Jewish scholarship.

Ziegler (*Der Kampf zwischen Judentum und Christentum in den drei ersten Jahrhunderten*, 1907), which, by ignoring the successive periods of early Jewish and rabbinical development, would seek to discredit *in toto* the unsympathetic statements of the synoptic Gospels upon the scribes and Pharisees. Thus, in spite of all pleading to the contrary, Schürer does seem to have got hold of the right sense of the term *Chaber*. In the Mishna, as he argues, it means "one who strictly keeps the law, including the *παράδοσεις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*, i.e. it is equivalent to "Pharisee." Now this lets us see deep into the estimate which Pharisaism cherished of its own position. As distinguished from the common people, the Pharisees are the *chaberim*, the brethren of the covenant, who represent the real community of Israel. According to the Old Testament view, every Israelite was the *chaber* of his neighbour, but the Pharisee would only recognize as such the man who scrupulously observed the law. This use of language resembles that of the pietists in modern Christianity. They call themselves by the simple name of "Christians." Others, no doubt, have a certain kind of Christianity. But they, and they alone, are the proper Christians. Similarly, the Pharisee only recognized the Pharisee as *Chaber*, as a brother of the covenant in the fullest sense of the term. All others¹ were "people of the land" (*vv.* 470–471).

To turn now to some of the minor points, upon which the present edition indicates a reconsideration of previous opinion, or an amplification of results hitherto held on less adequate grounds, we observe, e.g., that the note 147 on p. 35 of the Eng. tr. (vol. i.) is now expanded into a

¹ In his latest essay Friedländer, the Jewish scholar, vigorously defends the character of the Am-ha-aretz, protesting that they were really the pious, simple people, closely identified with the apocalyptic circles, who formed the healthy antipodes to the scribes and Pharisees.

closely-knit résumé of the arguments and evidence put forward last year by the author in Preuschen's *Zeitschrift für die neuest. Wissenschaft* (1906, 51–68), in order to prove that the *θύρα τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἡ λεγομένη ὥραια* (Acts iii. 2 = *ἡ ὥραια πύλη*, iii. 10) was the door at the eastern exit of the inner (or women's) court of the temple, which the Mishna calls "the door of Nicanor."

In the expanded note on *συναγωγή* (504–505, Eng. tr. i. 58–59), a parallel to the ideal sense of *ἐκκλησία* as opposed to *συναγωγή* is still sought in the supposed fact that *qāhāl* possessed a similarly high significance, although it has been repeatedly questioned (as e.g. by Hort, *Christian Ecclesia*, p. 15) whether the four proof-passages from the Talmud are sufficient evidence. On the meaning of *συναγώγιον*, however (p. 518, E. tr. ii. 69), Schürer handsomely retracts his previous verdict. As he now admits, it is impossible to regard the term as equivalent to *προσευκτήριον* or *σαββατεῖον*. It denotes "gathering," not "place of gathering." The extension of the use of *συναγωγή* to buildings originated in Palestine, and was not current in the diaspora until after the rise of Christianity, when it rivalled the older term *προσευχή* (cf. Acts xvi. 13, 16), which had been applied to the buildings for three centuries, as the Egyptian inscriptions prove. Acts, by employing *συναγωγή* in this sense for the diaspora (xiii. 5, etc.), seems to follow the Palestinian usage.

Another rather important change of view is presented on page 428 (cf. Eng. tr. i. 362–363) in connexion with Hillel's famous financial innovation of the *προσβολή* or registered declaration, which a creditor was permitted to make in court in order to secure payment of his money even during a Sabbatical year of legal release from all debts. Hitherto Schürer had explained the term from the opening words of the declaration ("I deliver to you"). But the linguistic

difficulty is serious, and he now accepts a suggestion made by Wilcken that the term is equivalent to the Latin juristic word *adjectio*, in the sense of "clause, or addition," the *προσβολή* or reservation of one's rights being an explanatory addition to the formal declaration. This seems very plausible; in default of a better theory, it may stand meantime.

On the Sadducees (pp. 475 f.), the estimate remains unaffected by Hölscher's brilliant attempt (*Der Sadduzäismus*, 1906) to discredit all the traditions which associate this party with the high priesthood. This involves, for one thing, as Schürer implies, far too radical and arbitrary a treatment of the literary sources, and, on the other hand, it does not satisfy the historical presuppositions of the post-Maccabean period.

The subsequent section (§ 27) on the school and the synagogue, one of the most instructive and fresh in the entire volume, has been brought up to date with especial care. Thus, on pp. 499–500 we find that a long note is inserted (Eng. tr. ii. 54) giving the evidence for synagogues in the Egyptian diaspora as far back as the third century B.C. Dr. Schürer, by the way, takes the phrase מִקְדָּשׁ אֱלֹהִים (Ps. lxxiv. 8), with most commentators, as an allusion to the synagogues, but there is a good case for the interpretation, recently favoured by Professor Kirkpatrick and Dr. Briggs, that the allusion is to feasts or festivals.

At the close of § 27 (Eng. tr. ii. 88), some account is added of the Genisa form (published by Schechter in 1898) of the Schmone-Esre. This shorter and more original Cairo version has 18 instead of 19 blessings, the 14th and 15th being combined in one. Its form of the 12th blessing shows that the Christians were really mentioned in this synagogal prayer, as Justin, Jerome, and Epiphanius allege. One sentence of the petition in question runs: "And may the Nozrim (i.e. Jewish Christians or Nazarenes) and Minim (i.e. heretics

or apostates in general) . . . be blotted out of the book of life." It adds singular point to the words of Paul (Phil. iv. 3) and the prophet John (Apoc. iii. 5), when we recollect that such a prayer was rising constantly from the lips of the rigid Jews in worship. Schürer incidentally agrees with M. Friedländer for once, that the identification of the Minim with Jewish Christians (favoured recently by Mr. Herford) is untenable.

As might be expected, the immense amount of recent discussion upon the messianic problem has led to many improvements and alterations in section 29 (pp. 579 f.). Thus Schürer's present view of the messianic hope in Ecclesiasticus (pp. 590 f.) contrasts vividly with his former statement (Eng. tr. ii. 138). The expectation of a personal messianic king falls into the background, in this book; and "if the writer looked for such a king, on the basis of prophetic prediction, his anticipation sprang from the study of Scripture rather than from a living religious need." Far closer to his heart than any revival of the Davidic house was the perpetuity of the high priesthood in the house of Phinehas. The allusions to a Davidic régime in xlvii. 11 and 22 are set aside as too uncertain, while the Hebrew text of li. 12 is pronounced a loan from the Schmone-Esre, which really expresses the hopes of a Davidic restoration cherished after the catastrophe of 70 A.D. "One cardinal point," Schürer goes on to observe, "in which the religious life of the older apocryphal books, like Sirach, Judith, Tobit, and First Maccabees is differentiated from the messianic hope of the later period, is its lack of the resurrection hope. The writings just mentioned occupy, in this aspect, the position of ancient Israel's outlook: the dead lead but a shadowy life in Sheol, and beyond the present there is no future life of bliss. The resurrection hope, attested by the book of Daniel, evidently did not succeed in becoming a common possession during the second century B.C.; into certain circles

(among the Sadducees) it failed to penetrate at all" (pp. 593–594). In a brief paragraph, with a note upon the relevant literature, at the close of part ii. (pp. 608 f.; Eng. tr. ii. p. 154), the author declines to dogmatize upon the messianic ideas of the Samaritans, owing to the lateness of the sources.

Among other additions in the following section (iii.) may be noted a paragraph (613–614, added to Eng. tr. ii. 159) upon the term *ἡλειμμένος*, which the Greek-speaking Jews of the second century adopted from Aquila as a substitute for *Χριστός*—the latter term having been appropriated by the Christians. Schürer also (p. 615) ranks himself among those who have refused to follow Lietzmann and Wellhausen in denying that "the Son of Man" is used as a name or title in Enoch. Strictly speaking, he notes, we must admit this. But as lxii. 7 and lxix. 27 show, the term is equivalent to a designation, and is fairly on the way to become a title. Again, on pp. 634–5, Schürer interpolates (after note 66 on p. 175 of the Eng. tr. vol. ii.) a paragraph to the effect that "Life in the messianic kingdom is represented as a condition of the most absolute bliss for which man can hope. No higher state is possible. The good things of heaven have come down to earth. Earth itself has become a part of heaven." Then he adds in a footnote: "This idea, which in itself is correct, has been emphasized in too sharp and one-sided a fashion by Baldensperger in his *Die messianisch-apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judentums* (1903), pp. 150–158. He tries even to show that, among several circles at least, the messianic kingdom was conceived as a kingdom in heaven, referring specially to the passage in Assumpt. Mos. x. But this passage stands by itself. Elsewhere indeed we do find the expectation of bliss for the individual in heaven side by side with the expectation of a messianic kingdom, but we must not combine the two and

argue that the messianic kingdom was to be in heaven. As is clear from the descent of Jerusalem and the gathering of the scattered Israelites in the holy land, that kingdom, despite all its heavenly character, was a kingdom upon earth, though we must admit, of course, that the distinction between heaven and earth vanishes at this point for the religious feeling—at least, that is to say, wherever the messianic kingdom forms the final and supreme object of human hope.” Frequently this was not the case. The messianic reign was sometimes regarded as the prelude to a further and ultimate era of bliss, as in the apocalypse of Baruch and Fourth Esdras.¹

The few pages upon the conception of the suffering Messiah (pp. 648–651) give a useful résumé of the prevalent opinion on this dogma. As Schürer rightly argues, it was far from being dominant in the Judaism of the period. It was scholastic rather than popular. The allusions in Matthew xvi. 22, etc., are enough to show the difficulty found by ordinary Jews in grasping the connexion between the Messiah and any atoning significance in his sufferings and death.

The closing section, on the Essenes (§ 30), has been enlarged by a careful running survey of the recent literature which has been lavished on this enigmatic sect. To the bibliography may be added, however, two French studies by Stapfer (*Revue de Théol. et Phil.*, 1902, 385–398) and P. Chapuis (“L’influence de l’essénisme sur les origines chrétiennes,” *Revue de Théol. et Phil.*, 1903, 193–228). Schürer still hesitates about committing himself to the hypothesis of Pythagorean influence. Like Professor Cheyne, he is evidently reluctant to wear Zeller’s colours in his casque. The special features common to the Essenes and the Pytha-

¹ This footnote ought to have been inserted in the text, in order to make the connexion clearer.

goreans were Oriental, he is content to remark, and some allowance must be made at any rate for Zoroastrian tendencies.

In a final note (p. 680) he refers to a portion of the forthcoming volume of the *Geschichte* for a notice of the Therapeutae, but plainly remains impenitent upon the authenticity of the *de vita contemplativa*. Mr. Conybeare's demonstration of its Philonic authorship does not seem to have convinced him.

JAMES MOFFATT.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

III.

THE GOSPEL NARRATIVES AND CRITICAL SOLVENTS.

It was before stated that a change in the treatment of the evidence for the Resurrection is necessitated by the new and more stringent methods of criticism applied to the narratives of the Gospels, and especially by the theory, now the prevalent one, of the dependence of the first and third Gospels, in their narrative parts, on the second—that of St. Mark. It is desirable, before proceeding further, to give attention to these new critical methods and their results, in their bearings on the subject in hand. It is, of course, too much to ask, even if one had the competency for the task, that a full discussion of the Synoptical problem should precede all examination of the narratives of the Resurrection, or that the Johannine question should be exhaustively handled before one is entitled to adduce a testimony from the Fourth Gospel. On the other hand, it seems imperative that something should be said on the critical aspect of the subject—enough at least to indicate the writer's own position, and some of the grounds that

are believed to justify it—still always with a strict eye on the special point under investigation.

It will prepare the way for this critical inquiry if a glance be taken first at the range of the New Testament material here falling to be dealt with. The narratives of the Resurrection go together with the narratives of the burial and of the post-Resurrection appearances of Jesus, and form an inseparable whole with them. Supplementary to the Gospel narratives are certain passages in the Book of Acts and in Paul.

The distribution of the subject-matter may be thus exhibited :—

St. Matthew : Burial, xxvii. 57–66 ; Resurrection, xxviii. 1–8 ; Appearances, xxviii. 9–20.

St. Mark : Burial, xv. 42–47 ; Resurrection, xvi. 1–8. *App. to St. Mark* : Appearances, xvi. 9–20.

St. Luke : Burial, xxiii. 50–56 ; Resurrection, xxiv. 1–12 ; cf. vers. 22–24 ; Appearances, xxiv. 12–53.

St. John : Burial, xxix. 38–42 ; Resurrection, xx. 1–13 ; Appearances, xx. 14–29 ; xxi.

Acts : Appearances, i. 3–11.

Paul : Burial and Resurrection, 1 Cor. xv. 4 ; Appearances, 1 Cor. xv. 5–8.

The narratives thus tabulated contain the historical witness to the Lord's Resurrection, so far as that witness has been preserved to us. On them, accordingly, the whole force of critical enginery has been directed, with the aim of discrediting their testimony. The narratives are held to be put out of court (1) On the ground of their manifest discrepancies ; (2) Through the application of critical methods to the text ; (3) Through the presence of legendary elements in their accounts.

The consideration of the alleged discrepancies can stand over, save as they prove to be involved in the general dis-

cussion. Even if all are admitted, they hardly touch the *main* facts of the combined witness—especially the testimony to the central fact of the empty tomb and the Lord's Resurrection on the third day. "No difficulty of weaving the separate incidents," says Dr. Sanday, "into an orderly and well-compacted narrative can impugn the unanimous belief of the Church which lies behind them, that the Lord Jesus rose from the dead on the third day and appeared to the disciples."¹ "There are many variations and discrepancies," writes Mr. F. C. Burkitt, "but all the Gospels agree in the main facts."² Strauss' statement of these discrepancies, which he discovers in every particular of the accounts, still remains the fullest and best, and the use he makes of them is not one to the liking of the newer criticism. "Hence," he says, "nothing but wilful blindness can prevent the perception that no one of the narrators knew and presupposed what another records."³

As previously indicated, the critical attack on the narratives of the Resurrection connects itself with the criticism of the Gospels as a whole. The newer criticism is principally distinguished from the older by a different attitude of mind to the Gospel material, and it proceeds by bolder and more assumptive methods. It starts rightly with a painstaking and exhaustive induction of the phenomena to be interpreted;⁴ its peculiarity comes to light in the more daring, and often extremely arbitrary way in which it goes about the interpretation. It is no longer held to be enough to determine and explain a text. The newer

¹ *Outlines of the Life of Christ*, p. 180: cf. Alford, *Greek Testament*, i. Prol. p. 20.

² *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 223.

³ *Life of Jesus*, iii. p. 344.

⁴ Illustrations are furnished in the analysis of the linguistic phenomena of the Gospels in Sir John Hawkins' *Horae Synopticae*, Plummer's *St. Luke*, Introd., Harnack's *Lukas der Artzt* (St. Luke and Acts), etc.

criticism must get behind the text and show its genesis ; must show by comparison with related texts its probable "genealogy ;" ¹ must take it to pieces, and discover what motive or tendency is at work in it, how it is coloured by environment and modified by later conditions—in brief, how it "grew" : this generally with the assumption that the saying or fact must originally have been something very different from what the text represents it to be. Such a method, no doubt, may open the way to brilliant discoveries, but it may also, and this more frequently, lead to the criticism losing itself in fanciful conjectures. Abundant illustration will be afforded when we come to the examination of the Resurrection narratives.

One question of no small importance is that of the relation of the Synoptical Gospels to each other. It has already been pointed out that the current theory on this subject—what Mr. W. C. Allen and Mr. Burkitt regard as "the one solid result" of the literary criticism of the Gospels—is that St. Matthew and St. Luke, as respects their narrative parts,² are based on St. Mark.³ It is desirable to keep this question in its right place. It would manifestly be a suicidal procedure to base the defence of the Resurrection on the acceptance or rejection of any given solution of the Synoptical problem, especially on the challenge of a theory which has obtained the assent of so many distinguished scholars. Assume it to be finally proved that St. Matthew and St. Luke used St. Mark as a chief "source,"

¹ Cf. Lake, *Res. of Jesus Christ*, pp. 167–8.

² The supposed *Logia* source does not come into consideration here.

³ Allen, *St. Matthew*, Pref. p. vii. : "Assuming what I believe to be the one solid result of literary criticism, viz., the priority of the second Gospel to the other two synoptic Gospels." Burkitt, *The Gospel History*, p. 37 : "the one solid contribution," etc. "We are bound to conclude that Mark contains the whole of a document which Matthew and Luke have independently used, and, further, that Mark contains very little besides."

the limits of the evidence for the Resurrection would be sensibly narrowed, but its intrinsic force would not be greatly weakened. St. Mark, after all, is not inventing. He is embodying in his Gospel the common Apostolic tradition of his time—a tradition which goes back to the Apostles themselves, and rests on their combined witness. There is no reason for believing that St. Mark took the liberties with the tradition, in altering and “doctoring” it, which some learned writers suppose. If the other Evangelists, whose Gospels, on any showing, are closely related to St. Mark’s, adopted the latter as one of their sources, it can only be because they recognized in that Gospel a form of the genuine tradition. Their adoption of it, and working of it up with their own materials, but set an additional imprimatur on its contents. At the same time, it is not to be gainsaid that, in practice, the attack on the credit of the Gospels has been greatly aided by the prevalence of this theory of the dependence of the other Synoptics on St. Mark. As before indicated, it affords leverage for treating the narratives of the first and third Gospels as a simple “writing up” and embellishing of St. Mark’s stories, and for rejecting any details not found in the latter as unhistorical and legendary. The *modus operandi* is expounded by Professor Lake. “When, therefore,” he says, “we find a narrative which is given in all three Gospels, we have no right to say that we have three separate accounts of the same incident; but we must take the account in Mark as presumably the basis of the other two, and ask whether their variations cannot be explained as due to obscurities or ambiguities in their sources, which they tried to clear up. . . . Since Matthew and Luke, so far as they are dealing with the Marcan source, are not first-hand evidence, but rather the two earliest attempts to comment on and explain Mark, we are by

no means bound to follow the explanations given by either.”¹

This leads to the question—Is the theory true? Despite its existing prestige, this may be gravely questioned. Detailed discussion would be out of place, but the bearing of the theory on the Resurrection narratives—which will be found to afford some of the most striking disproofs of it—is so direct, that a little attention must be given to it.

The grounds on which the Marcan theory rests are stated with admirable succinctness by Mr. Burkitt. “In the parts common to Mark, Matthew and Luke,” he says, there is a good deal in which all verbally agree; there is also much common to Mark and Matthew, and much common to Mark and Luke, but hardly anything common to Matthew and Luke which Mark does not share also. There is very little of Mark which is not more or less adequately represented either in Matthew or in Luke. Moreover, the common order is Mark’s order. Matthew and Luke never agree against Mark in transposing a narrative. Luke sometimes deserts the order of Mark, and Matthew often does so; but in these cases Mark is always supported by the remaining Gospel.²

With little qualification this may be accepted as a correct description of the facts, and it admirably proves that there existed what Dr. E. A. Abbott calls an “Original Tradition,” to which St. Mark, of the three Evangelists, most closely adhered, giving little else, while St. Matthew and St. Luke borrowed parts of it,³ combining it with material drawn from other funds of information. But

¹ *Ut supra*, p. 45.

² *Ut supra*, p. 36.

³ Cf. Abbott, *The Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels*, Introd., pp. vi., vii. “To speak more accurately, it is believed that the Gospel of St. Mark contains a closer approximation to the Original Tradition than is contained in the other Synoptics.”

does this prove the kind of *literary* dependence of the first and third Gospels on St. Mark which the current theory supposes? Or, if dependence exists in any degree, is this the form of theory which most adequately satisfies the conditions? It is not a question of the *facts*, but one rather of the *interpretation* of the facts. A few reasons may be offered for leaning to a negative answer to the above queries.

1. The impression undeniably produced by agreement in the character and order of the sections in the Gospels is seriously weakened when account is taken of the *widely divergent phraseology* in large parts of the resembling narratives. The divergence is so marked, and so often apparently without motive, that, notwithstanding frequent assonances in words and clauses, a direct borrowing of one Evangelist from another seems next to incredible. The narratives of the Resurrection are a palmary example,¹ but the same thing is observable throughout. Mr. Burkitt has been heard on the agreements; let Alford state the facts that make for literary independence. "Let any passage," he says, "common to the three Evangelists be put to the test. The phenomena presented will be much as follows: first, perhaps, we shall have three, five, or more words *identical*; then as many *wholly distinct*; then two clauses or more expressed in the same words but *differing order*; then a clause contained in one or two, and *not in the third*; then *several words identical*; then a clause or two not only *wholly distinct* but *apparently inconsistent*; and so forth; with recurrences of the same arbitrary and anomalous alterations, coincidences, and transpositions."² A simple way of testing this statement is to take such a book as Dr. Abbott's *The Common Tradition of the Synoptic Gospels*,

¹ See the words of Strauss quoted earlier.

² *Greek Testament*, i. Prol. p. 5.

where the narratives are arranged in parallel columns, and verbal agreements of the *three* Evangelists (the so-called "Triple Tradition"; the "Double Tradition" can be obtained by underlining in pencil) are indicated in black type, and note the proportion of agreement to divergence in the different sections. The proportion varies, but in most cases the amount of divergence will be found to be very considerable. Dr. Abbott himself goes so far as to say: "Closely though the Synoptists in some passages agree, yet the independence of their testimony requires in these days [as recently as 1884] no proof. Few reasonable sceptics now assert . . . that any of the three first Evangelists had before him the work of the other two. Proof, if proof were needed, might easily be derived from a perusal of the pages of the following Harmony, which would shew a number of divergencies, half-agreements, incomplete statements, omissions, incompatible, as a whole, with the hypothesis of borrowing."¹

It cannot be said that the difficulties created by these remarkable phenomena have, up to the present time, been successfully overcome by the advocates of the dependence theory. Dr. A. Wright, in contending for an original "oral" Mark, thinks they have not yet been removed.² Sir John Hawkins, though he argues for a use of St. Mark, yet draws attention to a large series of phenomena which he declares to be, "on the whole, and when taken together, inexplicable on any exclusively or mainly documentary

¹ *Ut supra*, Introd. p. vi.

² Cf. his *Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek*, Introd. p. x.: "At present the hypothesis of a Ur-Markus having been discredited and practically abandoned, the supporters of documents insist—in spite (as I think) of the very serious difficulties which they have not yet removed—that St. Mark's Gospel was used by St. Matthew and St. Luke." He points out elsewhere the difficulties of supposing that St. Luke used St. Mark (p. xvi.). Dr. Wright's own theory of a proto-, deutero-, and trito-Mark is loaded with many difficulties.

theory." "Copying from documents," he says, "does not seem to account for them : but it is not at all difficult to see how they might have arisen in the course of oral transmission."¹ To bring the phenomena into harmony with the theory of literary dependence on St. Mark there is needed the assumption of a freedom in the use of sources by St. Matthew and St. Luke which passes all reasonable bounds, and commonly admits of no satisfactory explanation. "The Evangelists," says Mr. Burkitt, "altered freely the earlier sources which they used as the basis of their narratives."² This freedom of theirs is then used as proof that "literary piety is a quality . . . which hardly makes its appearance in Christendom before 150 A.D."³ With doubtful consistency the same writer declares that, if the Evangelists had worked on a "fixed oral tradition," he "cannot imagine how they dared to take such liberties with it"!⁴ That is, a "fixed tradition" is sacred, and dare not be tampered with, but a document *embodying* this tradition, even though by a writer like St. Mark, is liable to the freest literary manipulation! It is to be remembered that the proof of the alleged lack of "literary piety" is mainly the assumption itself that St. Mark *was* used by the other Evangelists.

2. Assuming, however, some degree of dependence in the relations of the Gospels, the question is still pertinent—Is the theory of dependence on St. Mark *that which alone, or best, satisfies the conditions?* It has not always

¹ *Horae Synopticae*, p. 52. The instances given in Pt. iv., sects. ii., iii., include variations in the reports of the sayings of Jesus, the attribution of the same, or similar words, to different speakers, the use of the same, or similar words, as parts of a speech, and as part of the Evangelist's narrative, transpositions, etc.

² *Ut supra*, p. 18.

³ P. 15.

⁴ P. 35. Elsewhere he bases an argument on St. Luke's "literary good faith" (p. 118).

been thought that it is, and very competent scholars, on grounds that seem cogent, take the liberty of doubting it still. It is almost with amused interest that one, in these days, reads the lengthy and learned argumentation of a Baur, a Strauss, a Dr. S. Davidson,¹ to demonstrate from the textual phenomena that St. Mark was the *latest* of the three Gospels, and depended on St. Matthew and St. Luke, not they on St. Mark.² The very phenomena now relied on to prove the originality of St. Mark, e.g., his picturesqueness, are turned by these writers into an argument against him. The argument from verbal coincidences is reversed, and St. Mark is made out to be based on the others because in numerous instances St. Mark's text agrees partly with St. Matthew and partly with St. Luke. And, assuredly, if dependence is assumed, lists can easily be furnished in which the secondary character of the text of St. Mark can as plausibly be maintained. But the Tübingen theory of St. Mark's dependence is by no means the only alternative to the prevailing view. The learned Professor Zahn, e.g., strikes out on a different line, and supposes a dependence of St. Mark on the *Aramaic* St. Matthew, but, conversely, a partial dependence of the *Greek* St. Matthew on the canonical St. Mark.³ It is, in short, yet too early to take the dependence on St. Mark as a fixed result.

¹ Cf. Strauss, *New Life of Jesus*, i. pp. 169-183; S. Davidson, *Introd. to New Testament*. i. pp. 278 ff., etc.

² More recently, the dependence of St. Mark on St. Matt. and St. Luke is upheld by an able scholar, Dr. Colin Campbell, whose work, *The First Three Gospels in Greek, arranged in Parallel Columns* (2nd edition, 1899), is designed to support this thesis. In a recent communication Dr. C. writes: "I have seen nothing yet to alter my conviction as to the substantial truth [of this hypothesis] . . . Every detail I have accumulated—and I have a large mass of material—convinces me that the prevalent view is wrong. . . . There are multitudes of expressions in Mark which are best understood if we presuppose his use of Matthew and Luke." (Pages of instances are given.)

³ *Einleitung*, ii. pp. 322 ff.

3. A strong argument against the current theory seems to the present writer to arise from *St. Luke's Prologue*,¹ in which the principles which guided the Evangelist in the composition of his Gospel are explicitly laid down. It is to be noted that, in this Preface, St. Luke assumes that the chief matters he is about to relate are already well known—fully established (*πεπληροφορημένων*)—in the churches; that they had been received from those who “from the beginning were eye-witnesses (*αὐτόπται*) and ministers of the word”; that they had been the subject of careful catechetical instruction (*κατηχήθης*); that many attempts had already been made to draw up written narratives of these things. For himself St. Luke claims that he has “traced the course of all things accurately from the first,” and his object in writing, as he says, “in order” (*καθεξῆς*), is that Theophilus may “fully know” (*ἐπιγνῶς*) the “certainty” (*ἀσφάλειαν*) of those things concerning which he had already been orally instructed. Does this, it may be asked, suggest such a process of composition as the current theory supposes? St. Luke speaks, indeed, of “many” who had taken in hand to draw up written narratives. He alludes to these earlier attempts, not disparagingly, but evidently as implying that they were unauthoritative, lacked order, and generally were unfitted for the purpose his own Gospel was intended to serve. He himself, in contrast with the “many,” goes back to first-hand sources, and writes “in order.” He is not appropriating the work of others, but drawing from his own researches.² How does this

¹ Luke i. 1-4; cf. on this point Dr. A. Wright, *St. Luke's Gospel in Greek*, pp. xiv., xv.; *Synopsis of Gospels in Greek*, p. xviii.

² Dr. Wright says: “His authorities were not written documents, but partly eye-witnesses, partly professional catechists” (*ut supra*). Dr. Plummer says: “That [the reference to ‘eye-witness’] would at once exclude Matthew, whose Gospel Luke does not appear to have known. It is doubtful whether Mark is included in the πολλοί.”

tally with the hypothesis now in vogue ? On this hypothesis another principal Gospel not only existed, but was known to St. Luke, and was used by him as a main basis of his own. This Gospel was the work of John Mark, son of Mary of Jerusalem, companion of St. Peter ; therefore may be presumed to have been of high authority. St. Luke sets such value on St. Mark's Gospel that he takes up fully two-thirds of its contents into his own—draws from it, in fact, nearly all his narrative material. He relies so much on its "order" that in only one or two instances does he venture to deviate from it. Does this harmonize with the account he himself gives ? The linguistic phenomena in St. Luke, which show a far wider divergence from the Marcan type than in the first Gospel, again present difficulties.¹ On the other hand, the "order," which appears to belong to the form which the narratives had come to assume before any Gospel was written,² cannot alone be relied on to prove dependence, and singular *omissions* remain to be accounted for.³

On the whole, therefore, it appears safer not to allow a theory of dependence to rule the treatment, or to create an initial prejudice against one Gospel in comparison with another. St. Matthew and St. Luke may be heard without assuming that either Gospel, in its narrative portions, is a simple echo of St. Mark.

It is impossible here to enter on the grounds which, it

¹ Cf. Wright, *Synopsis*, p. xvi.

² In all the Synoptics certain groups or chains of events are linked together in the same way, evidently as the result of traditional connexion. E.g., the Cure of the Paralytic, the Call and Feast of Matthew, Questionings of Pharisees and of John's Disciples ; again, the Plucking of the Ears of Corn, the Cure of the Man with the Withered Hand (Sabbath Stories). St. Matthew frequently transposes, in the interests of his own plan—chiefly, however, in the *earlier* part of his Gospel.

³ Cf. Burkitt, p. 130 : "He freely omits large portions of Mark," etc. One important series in St. Matthew (xiv. 22–xvi. 12) and St. Mark (vi. 45–viii. 26) is, for no obvious reason, wholly omitted in St. Luke.

is believed, justify the view that the Fourth Gospel is a genuine work of the Apostle John,¹ containing authentic reminiscences of that Apostle of the Lord's doings and teachings, especially in Judæa, and in His more intimate intercourse with His disciples, thus filling up the outline of the other Evangelists in places which they had left blank.² The difficulty which weighs so strongly with Mr. Burkitt of finding a place in the framework of St. Mark for the Raising of Lazarus is certainly not insuperable ;³ while his own view of the free invention of this and other incidents and discourses by the Evangelist⁴ deprives the Gospel of even the slightest claim to historical credit. But the whole tone of the Gospel suggests a writer who has minute and accurate knowledge of the matters about which he writes—down even to small personal details—and who *means* to be taken as a faithful witness.⁵ As such he is accepted here.

The way is now open for the consideration of the application of these critical theories to the narratives of the Resurrection, and attention may first be given to certain features in the accounts of the Resurrection itself.

At first sight, nothing might seem plainer than that the narratives of the first three Gospels, while necessarily related, are yet *independent*, in the sense that no one of them is copied from, or based on, the others. As already hinted, the difficulties of a theory of dependence are here

¹ Reference may simply be made to the works of Principal Drummond and Dr. Sanday on the Fourth Gospel. Mr. Burkitt is hard driven when he relies on the late and untrustworthy references to Papias to overturn the unanimous early tradition of St. John's residence in Ephesus (p. 252).

² Mr. Burkitt doubts if our Synoptic Gospels contain stories from more than forty separate days of our Lord's life (p. 20).

³ Cf. pp. 222-3, and Pref. to 2nd edition.

⁴ "If [Mark] did not know of it [The Raising of Lazarus], can we believe that, as a matter of fact, it ever occurred?" Cf. pp. 225-6, 237, etc.

⁵ The interesting treatment of "The Historical Problems of the Fourth Gospel," from a lay point of view, in R. H. Hutton's *Theological Essays*, well deserves attention at the present time.

at their maximum. In scarcely any particular—time, names and number of women, events at the grave, number, appearance and position of angels, etc.—do their accounts exactly agree. This is indeed the stronghold of the argument from “discrepancies,” of which so much is made. The theory, however, is, that the narratives in St. Matthew and St. Luke are derived from the simpler story of St. Mark; and in carrying through this theory the advocates of dependence are driven to the most arbitrary and complicated hypotheses to explain how the divergences arose. It will be interesting to watch the process of dissolving the credit of the narratives by the aid of this assumption in the skilled hands of a writer like Professor Lake—though the result may rather appear as a *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory itself.

To begin with, certain cases of omission of details by St. Matthew and St. Mark are proposed to be solved by the hypothesis of an “original Mark” (*Ur-Markus*), from which these details were absent. Professor Lake, while not committing himself to the theory, which Dr. Wright tells us is now “discredited and practically abandoned,”¹ yet so far inclines to it that he thinks—the reader will note the *simplicity* of the hypothesis—“there is something to be said for the view that the original Marcan document did not give any names in Mark xv. 47, and that this form was used by Luke;² that a later edition, used by Matthew, identified the women as Mary Magdalene and the other Mary; and that another editor produced the text which is found in the canonical Mark.”³

More serious, however, is the difficulty that the narratives are frequently divergent in phraseology and circumstance

¹ *Synopsis*, p. x.

² It is a difficulty that St. Luke so often omits the proper names in St. Mark. Cf. Wright, *ut supra*.

³ Lake, *ut supra*, p. 54.

in what they *do* relate. How is this to be explained? To take a leading example, St. Mark narrates of the women that, "entering into the tomb, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, arrayed in a white robe."¹ St. Matthew has an independent story of a great earthquake, and represents an angel as rolling away the stone and sitting upon it.² St. Luke records that, when they had entered the tomb, "two men stood by them in dazzling apparel."³ No divergence could be greater, on the principle that "the two other Gospels, Matthew and Luke, are closely based on the Marcan narrative."⁴ But Professor Lake is not discouraged. Accepting St. Mark's narrative as the original, "the others," he thinks, "all fall into place on an intelligible though complicated system of development under the influence of known causes."⁵ "Complicated" indeed—and unreal—as will be seen by glancing at it.

First, there is a slight (infinitesimal) possibility that the Marcan text may originally have read, "came to the tomb" (instead of "entered into"),⁶ and this left it doubtful whether the "young man" of the story was seen "on the right side" *inside* or *outside* the tomb.⁷ In "elucidating" the point left in ambiguity, St. Luke took it the one way and St. Matthew the other—hence their variation. Only, if this is not the correct reading, the explanation falls.

Next, the "young man" in St. Mark "appears without any explanation of his identity or mission."⁸ He was really, on Professor Lake's theory, as will be seen later, a youth at the spot who tried to persuade the women that they had come to the wrong tomb.⁹ Naturally, however, attempts were soon made to identify him. "The most obvious view for that generation, in which angelology was

¹ Mark xvi. 5.² Matt. xxviii. 2-5.³ Luke xxiv. 3-5.⁴ *Ut supra*, p. 63.⁵ P. 62-3.⁶ The Vat MS. reads *ελθεῖναι*.⁷ *Ut supra*, pp. 62-3.⁸ P. 184.⁹ Cf. pp. 251-2.

so powerful a force, was that he was an angel. This view is adopted in Matthew.”¹ “Still a further step is to be found in the doubling of the angel, again strictly in accordance with Jewish thought.” This in St. Luke, St. John, and the Gospel of Peter.² “Why are there two men in Luke instead of one? The answer is not quite plain, but it seems probable that there was a general belief in Jewish and possibly other circles that two angels were specially connected with the messages of God.”³ Elsewhere the probability is conceded that St. Luke is here following a different tradition from St. Mark’s.⁴ But why, then, not all through?

We are not done yet, however, with this “young man” of St. Mark’s narrative. An attempt is made “to bring together and trace the development of the various forms in which the original ‘young man’ is represented in various books.”⁵ “Two hypotheses,” we are told, “naturally presented themselves: one that the young man was an angel; the other that he was the Risen Lord Himself.”⁶ St. Matthew, after his manner, adopted both views. The angel sitting on the stone is one form: the appearance of Jesus to the women as they went⁷ is the other. This appearance of Jesus recorded by St. Matthew is held to be a “doublet” of St. Mark’s young man story. So is St. John’s account of the appearance of the Lord to Mary Magdalene.⁸

If attention has been given to this incident in some detail, it is because, in its far-fetched conjectures and hypothetical ingenuities, it represents so characteristically the processes by which it is sought to dissipate the credibility of the Gospel narratives, and the methods by which the Marcan theory is applied to this end. The real effect of its forced

¹ P. 185.² P. 185.³ P. 67.⁴ Pp. 67, 92.⁵ P. 67.⁶ P. 85.⁷ P. 85, Matt. xxviii. 9.⁸ P. 186, John xx. 14, 15.

combinations and toppling structure "of possibles" and "perhapses" is to cast doubt on the theory with which it starts, and lend strength to the view of the independence of the narratives. After all, why should St. Luke, whose narrative is so very divergent, be supposed to be dependent on St. Mark in his account of the Resurrection? Professor Lake has been heard admitting that it is possible that St. Luke followed a different tradition. Going a stage further back, we find Mr. Burkitt allowing that St. Luke in the Passion "deserts Mark to follow another story of the last scenes."¹ At the other end, St. Luke is admittedly original in his account of the *post*-Resurrection appearances. Why then should he not be so in the narrative of the Resurrection itself? The same question may be asked regarding St. Matthew. The harmonistic expedients censured in commentators are mild in comparison with the violence needed to evolve the narratives of either of the other Evangelists out of that of St. Mark.

The detailed examination of the narratives next to be undertaken will further illustrate the untenableness of the new critical constructions, and provide the basis of a positive argument for the reality of the Resurrection.

JAMES ORR.

SHAKING OUT THE LAP.

NEHEMIAH v. 13.

It is perhaps not generally known that "*shaking out the lap*" is still practised in the East. The text (Neh. v. 13) occurs in the following context: "I pray you let us leave off this usury"; (v. 11) "Restore, I pray you, to them, even this day, their fields, their vineyards, their oliveyards, and their houses, also the hundredth part of

¹ *Ut supra*, p. 130.

the money, and of the corn, the wine, and the oil, that ye exact of them"; (v. 12) "Then said they, We will restore them, and will require nothing of them; so will we do, even as thou sayest. Then I called the priests, and *took an oath of them*, that they should do according to this promise"; (v. 13) "*Also I shook out my lap*, and said, *So God shake out every man from his house, and from his labour*, that performeth not this promise; *even thus be he shaken out, and emptied*. And all the congregation said Amen."

Shaking out the lap is in this passage a solemn form of *curse*. It is an instance of cursing by imitation,¹ one of the methods familiar to every student of folklore. The point in these imitative acts is possibly that one shows to the divinity what is wished. In pure magic the imitative act is thought to be in itself in some obscure way sufficient to reach the desired effect.

Whatever may have been thought with regard to this act by the Jewish nobles and priests who surrounded Nehemiah when "*shaking out his lap*," the custom is still extant, and perhaps an inquirer on the spot might be able to detect what is the actual Oriental feeling connected with it.

When a modern Greek wishes to express his contempt or disgust for some one present he takes his coat with thumb and forefinger near one of the upper button-holes and stretches it out for a few moments.²

This may be precisely the same act as described in Nehemiah v. 13. The Alexandrian version of the passage (2 Ezra xv. 13) runs, according to cod. B: *καὶ τὴν ἀναβολήν μου ἐξείλναξα*, and I *shook out* my lap, but the first hand

¹ Hairs, etc., tied in a knot and buried in order to deprive a woman of fertility, waxen statues pierced with needles, etc.

² For this information concerning modern Greek life I rely upon a witness who lived in Athens for several years and possessed an intimate knowledge of the language and the people.

of the Sinaitic MS. (N*) reads καὶ τὴν ἀναβολὴν μου ἐξέτεινα, and I *stretched out* my lap.

This variation is almost a proof that the identification given above is right, since even now it is difficult to say whether the person who acts in such a manner as described above is simply stretching out his coat or actually shaking it. He may shake it when only meaning to stretch it out or, on the other hand, the stretching out may be a shorter form of the (symbolical) shaking. This last may be the truth, since shortening and symbolizing of imitative curses and prayers is an often observed phenomenon.

If we were bound to choose between the readings ἐξετίναξα (B) and ἐξέτεινα (N*) one might be tempted to prefer the last. Two things are in its favour: (α) *ardua lectio praestat*; since with a view to the meaning of the Hebrew root, *n'r* = *to shake*, and the repeated use of ἐκτινάξαι in the context,¹ the reading ἐξέτεινα is certainly the harder one and more liable to be corrected away (β). Moreover, it is known that the LXX. habitually assimilate Hebrew peculiarities or even antiquities to the Greek environment in which they lived.²

The man, therefore, who represented the Hebrew *hasni nā'arti* by τὴν ἀναβολὴν μου ἐξέτεινα may have given a somewhat free rendering, since he knew from daily life that the shaking out of the lap was often reduced to a mere stretching—the other who wrote ἐξετίναξα actually gave a verbal translation. After all, the facts seem to be about equally in favour of both readings. Either of them may

¹ *Old Testament in Greek* (Swete), ii. p. 191. Ἐσδρας B, xv. 12 seq.: καὶ εἶπαν Ἀποδώσομεν καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν οὐ ζητήσομεν οὕτως ποιήσομεν καθὼς σὺ λέγεις. καὶ ἐκάλεσα τοὺς ἱερεῖς καὶ ὥρκισα αὐτοὺς ποιῆσαι ὡς τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο. (13) καὶ τὴν ἀναβολὴν μου ἐξετίναξα [ἐξέτεινα N ἐξετείναξα N^m] καὶ εἶπα Οὕτως ἐκτινάξαι ὁ θεὸς πάντα ἄνδρα ὃς οὐ στήσει τὸν λόγον τοῦτον ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ κόπου αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔσται οὕτως ἐκτετιναγμένος καὶ κενός.

² Cf. e.g., Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, s.v.: ἀφεις, διῶρυξ, etc.; also EXPOSITOR, Dec. 1907, pp. 516–7.

be the original, and either of them the emendation. If the shaking was corrected into stretching out, it was perhaps daily experience which suggested the alteration, in the opposite case Hebrew knowledge and a desire for accuracy may have been the motives. It is not so probable that the whole of the textual problem should be a curious and rare coincidence between actual facts¹ and a scribe's blunder in omitting the last two letters of a word.

That shaking out the lap is a sort of *curse* even nowadays—however much its importance may have diminished in the course of time—appears from the fact that the person against whom it is directed is sometimes seen to cross himself instantly, once or several times.

J. DE ZWAAN.

*ST. LUKE'S ACCOUNT OF THE LAST SUPPER: A
CRITICAL NOTE ON THE SECOND SACRAMENT.*

[In the following note I have tried to deal absolutely fairly with a somewhat difficult question. Writing as an Anglican clergyman, I have avoided, as far as possible, any "denominational" questions. Indeed, I believe there is nothing in this paper on which Lutherans, Calvinists, Romans, or Anglicans need differ. As an Anglican priest, I have naturally referred, when necessary, to the English Prayer Book. But this was unavoidable, if only because every Minister of the Living God must know best the forms with which he is most familiar: and the *Via Media* certainly

¹ Another possible parallel which may be important, if one wishes to investigate this matter more thoroughly, was suggested to me by Dr. Hesseling, Professor of Mediæval and Modern Greek in the University of Leiden. It is the story of the Roman Ambassadors in Livy xxi. 18, § 13, who told the Carthaginian Magistrates that they brought either peace or war. As the Roman ultimatum was rejected, they also shook out their mantles.

ought to lead, at least, to sympathetic dealing with, and an absence of offence towards, all. As a more or less conservative critic, my paper may be somewhat "apologetic"; but here again I can plead that I have spared neither thought nor reading in an effort to appreciate fully, and deal honestly and courteously with, the opinions and proofs of those more "advanced" than myself.

I have written, as much as possible, in English, since, in spite of the general learning of those to whom the EXPOSITOR most appeals, my conclusions may prove interesting to some who, like Shakspeare, have "small Latin and less Greek": and the Veil of the Presence is often transparent enough to those who, in questions of criticism, have to rely mainly on the learning of others.

The abbreviations here used are, as a rule, generally understood. The codices are marked with their usual symbols, "N" for the Sinaitic MS., "B" for the great Vatican codex, "A" for the untrustworthy "Alexandrian," "C" for the palimpsest named after Ephrem the Syrian, "D" for Beza's codex. I have to thank Dr. Arthur Wright (whose *Synopsis of the Gospels* is quoted as "S G") for the following abbreviations: "l" and "ll" signify MSS. (one or more) of the ancient Latin versions; "s" and "ss" of the Syriac; "s^s" is an interesting Syriac document, the "Lewis-Gibson Syriac Palimpsest." The text I have chiefly used is "WH," Westcott and Hort's admirable critical text, and the grounds of the text have been checked by "S G." In the particular passage here discussed I differ from "WH" and "S G," and the paper is an attempt to give good reasons for this difference.]

There are certain axioms with which a critic must start, unless he wants to write a whole book in order to prove what is either self-evident or has been proved already.

The New Testament itself gives us four accounts of the

Institution of Holy Communion. Of the four, that given by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians may (from the relative dates of the Epistle and—to a high probability—of the Gospels) be taken as the earliest *written* account. The others may rest on an older account, written or oral, but we have no ground to suppose that the Synoptists held materials that were inaccessible to St. Paul, and St. Paul himself seems to claim that he received his account by revelation. There is a strong resemblance between the account in the Third Gospel and in 1 Corinthians, a resemblance that seems only natural to those who accept Luke the Physician as the author of that Gospel.¹ In any case, there is no ground for supposing that St. Luke, whether he derived his account of the Last Supper from St. Paul or not, was in any way less well equipped than the authors of the first two Gospels for giving an accurate account of the Last Supper. The first two Synoptists evidently derive their accounts from the same source, oral or written, St. Matthew's being an expansion of St. Mark's, or St. Mark's a compression of St. Matthew's.² Certain parts of the narrative are absolutely alike in all the accounts, notably the description of the manual acts, the words of Consecration of the Bread, "THIS IS MY BODY," and part of the corresponding words as to the cup, "THIS" (or "THIS CUP") "IS MY BLOOD,"—St. Matthew and St. Mark reading "My Blood of the Covenant," St. Luke and St. Paul "The new Covenant in my Blood." So, too, all accounts agree in *not* stating certain things. None of them says that our Lord Himself partook of either the Bread or

¹ Personally, I think this needs no special proof. But, in addition to the evidence of tradition, etc., it is worth observing the prevalence of medical terms, the fact that "The Gospel of the Infancy," which probably came from the Blessed Virgin herself, contains details that she probably would not have given to any one but a medical man, etc.

² This applies to this special section only, without prejudice to the origin or relation of these Gospels as a whole.

the cup. None states what the cup contained, though the three Gospel accounts all use the words "This fruit of the vine,"—St. Matthew and St. Mark *after* the account of the Institution, St. Luke (in the commonly received text) *before*. Again, all call the bread "ἄρτον," i.e. "a loaf," and all refer to it, in the words of consecration, as τοῦτο, i.e. "this thing."

Among differences we may note the following, the use or not of the word ποτήριον, i.e. "cup," in the Consecration of the second Element, the peculiar phrase, "Drink ye all of it," in St. Matthew, balanced in St. Mark by the words "And they all drank of it,"—a slight difference as to the use of εὐλογήσας (blessing) and εὐχαριστήσας (giving thanks) between St. Luke and the other Evangelists, etc. These are either trifles, or points which can be used for the elucidation of the greatest difficulty, which is this : St. Luke (i.) adds a very important passage after the blessing of the Bread, in which he is partly supported by St. Paul ; (ii.) adds another similar passage, again supported by St. Paul, after the blessing of the cup ; and (iii.) describes very closely the blessing of a cup *before* the blessing of the bread.

Round these three points the real controversy turns. Are St. Luke's additions genuine ? Is the *first* cup the real "Cup of Blessing" ? Is the description of the blessing of the *second* cup due to an abortive attempt to harmonise the older with the newer tradition ? A theory has been built upon the supposition that—from local custom or some such reason—St. Luke deliberately placed the blessing of the Eucharistic cup before that of the Bread, and that his copyists introduced the whole passage (including the account of the blessing of the *second* cup and the formula then used), deliberately or accidentally, to bring the *order* of the Third Gospel into harmony with that of the first two and of St. Paul. This "One Cup theory" now largely holds the field, but it is obviously desirable to see what light is thrown

on the whole story of the Eucharist by collating and summarising, from the point of view of the "Two Cups theory," the story told by the four narratives as they appear. This will naturally be followed by an examination of the evidence for the genuineness of the disputed passage in St. Luke.

In order to summarise the narrative, I may call attention to certain points. (i.) While the stories of the first two Synoptists place the words, "I will not henceforth drink of this fruit of the vine," *after* the consecration of the Cup, St. Luke, taking the usually received text, places it at the very beginning of the feast. Thus the Synoptists agree in making these words no part of the *actual* Institution of the Sacrament. (ii.) St. Paul, describing the Institution, omits these words altogether,—negative evidence, but practically an implication that he regarded the words as not belonging to the Sacramental formulae. (iii.) Thus, in St. Matthew and St. Mark, no connexion is shown between the words "This fruit of the vine" and any wine at the time in use. (iv.) In St. Luke, the words are certainly associated with the blessing of a cup at the beginning of the Feast. So I believe I am justified in supposing that the accounts of the first two Synoptists are "out of order" on this point, and that they really should be placed at the *beginning* of the story. I shall show afterwards that there is independent evidence as to the use of such a cup, and in such a way, as a part of the "Memorial Pass-over," as it is observed now and was in all human probability celebrated in the time of our Lord.

The account, summarised, runs as follows; and I claim that, waiving for the present the question as to the genuineness of the disputed passage in St. Luke, it is absolutely consistent. It is not, to be sure, consistent with a theory of verbal Inspiration: but theories of verbal Inspiration are, quite apart from this question, as dead as any nails that were ever driven into any door: and there is no possible method of

harmonising the accounts that can make them verbally identical.

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, in the same night in which He was betrayed, said to His Apostles, "With desire I have desired to eat this as the Passover ¹ with you before I suffer : for I say unto you, that I will no more eat of it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of (α . God) (β . my Father). And having received a cup and given thanks, He said : Take this (cup), and (α . divide it among you), (β . ² drink ye all of it) : for I say unto you, I will henceforth drink no more of this fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God come."

"And taking a loaf, He (α . gave thanks and gave it to them), (β . blessed it) saying, THIS THING IS MY BODY, which (α . is) (β . is given) for you. Do this as my Memorial. So likewise (taking and blessing) a Cup after supper, He said, (α . This cup is the New Covenant in my Blood) (β . This is my Blood of the Covenant) shed (α . on your behalf) (β . for many). Do this, as often as ye drink it, as my Memorial."

In this summary I have omitted St. Matthew's phrase "for the remission of sins," as it is entirely unsupported by any other narrator ; nevertheless, it *may* represent a true tradition, though the lack of support by St. Mark is on the whole against it. For the same reason I have omitted St. Matthew's word "eat," after "take." Neither of these points is of any importance, and I fail to see any practical difference in the variations marked between brackets. Taking the account as a whole, it possesses several internal evidences of veracity. It clearly distinguishes between the merely Paschal and the Eucharistic portions of the story ; it shows an absolute symmetry between the former and the latter ; it clearly separates the beginning and the end of the

¹ τοῦτο τὸ πᾶσχα. The importance of this translation will be shown later on.

² St. Mark has instead, "And they all drank of it."

feast. The only difficulty disclosed by this arrangement—apart from those arising from the critical examination of the (supposed) doubtful words in St. Luke's account—is that it leaves a long empty gap between the beginning of the Supper and the Institution of the Sacrament. But, unless we reject the whole Johannine account, we must allow a long time for the teaching and transactions recorded in the Fourth Gospel: and, in any case, there is no special reason for believing that the whole story of the Supper formed part of the Synoptic or any other traditions.

The really important difficulty is to be found in two passages recorded in the Third Gospel, which are rejected by many critics; indeed, the *whole* passage in which they occur is placed between double brackets in the WH text, and the whole passage is also rejected in S G. The doubtful words are as follows:—and it is worth observing that, *a priori*, there is just as much reason for supposing them to have been rejected in favour of the “One Cup theory,” or omitted in the interests of the “Two Cup” belief. Thus the question of their genuineness depends entirely on the actual evidence, external and internal, given by MSS. and versions, or supplied by examination of the passages themselves. In WH we find after “This is my Body”:

[[τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων, Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ ἐν τῷ Αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.]] In other words, WH omits the following English words from the text of St. Luke:

“Which is given on your behalf: do this as my Memorial. So likewise ¹ the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new Covenant in my Blood, which is shed” (or ‘poured out’) on your behalf.”

The R.V. admits the whole of this passage into the text,

¹ Or “a”—the *τό* is certainly doubtful.

but has, as a marginal note, "Some ancient authorities omit *which is given for you . . . which is poured out for you.*" Thus the Revisers' text admits the genuineness of the passage, though it also admits that "some ancient authorities" omit a small part of it. The American Revisers have recorded no protest. Thus we see that the whole passage has commended itself to the highest scholarship of the United Kingdom and the United States: and, in particular, that their readings involve the absolute acceptance of the "Two Cup" theory.

We may also remark, in passing, that the disputed passage is strongly Lucco-Hebraic. *Ποιεῖτε* ("do" in whatever sense the word may be used), *ἀνάμνησις* ("Memorial"), and *διαθήκη* ("Covenant") are all used in special and technical senses in *Hebrews*. It is equally worth observing that the presence of these words, close together, is an argument in favour of the genuineness of the passage, for those who believe in the Lucan authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews,¹ and that a scribe, writing before the time of the common origin of N and B, both of which have the passage, could not well have taken the theory of the Lucan authorship of *Hebrews* as a basis for a forgery. The theory prevalent in the third century was not Lucan: so the writer of the common original *n'aurait pas de quoi*.

But, since the time of the R.V., a strong feeling has grown up among scholars against the genuineness of the passage. We may take WH as the basis of this opinion: S G gives the text, with the doubtful part cleared out, and adds the omitted words in the margin, with the authorities for their preservation. The Reverend Dr. Plummer (p. 496 in the volume on "St. Luke" in the *International Critical Commentary*) rejects the words on what seem to me weak internal grounds, and adds the authorities for their omission.

¹ See my article in the *Expositor*, July and August, 1904.

These are all good and scholarly exponents of the "One Cup" theory, and most certainly cannot be accused of prejudice in favour of its rival. So, with a passing protest against the assumption that a text based on codices and versions can be regarded as final, until it has been carefully checked by the mass of quotations contained in the early liturgies and Fathers, a task too herculean for accomplishment within the life-time of any man, I pass on to the external and internal criticism of the passage.

I. EXTERNAL CRITICISM.

The first requisite to a fair criticism is, undoubtedly, a thorough realisation of the bearing of the most important codices and versions on the subject. For this purpose it would be desirable to inquire into the exact value of every MS.: but it is sufficient for our present need to remember a very few facts. (1) WH take, as the primary principle of their text, the proposition that a group of codices headed by \aleph and B is, except under very exceptional circumstances, of higher value than a group headed by any other combination of uncials. (2) A is a MS. of another school, whose general "type" of text is inaccurate; and, as a matter of fact, the readings of A are now hardly ever quoted by any competent critic. (3) C, when its readings can be clearly brought to light under the comparatively modern writing that covers it (a task greatly helped recently by photography), is a very good palimpsest; but it is, at the earliest, an early fifth century document, i.e.,—it is younger than B by, say, almost a century, and than \aleph by anything from fifty years to a hundred. (4) D, "Beza's Codex," has always been noted for the eccentricity of its readings. By a recent revision, its value has been enhanced through the removal of some of these peculiarities: but its exact age is doubtful;

it cannot be, at the earliest, less than fifty years younger than C, and no careful student dares to assume anything with certainty as to its precise age. Putting all the facts together, a group headed by D is, from the point of view of external criticism, of very small value indeed.

Now, Dr. Wright (in S G) accepts the reading of WH, deciding *against* the doubtful passage. But he gives the formula of external authority in its favour thus :

“NBCllss + τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς (B omits εἰς) τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. (v. 20) NBlls^s + καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λεγὼν (s^s + λάβετε τοῦτο, διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς) NBlls^s + τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου NBll + τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.” That is to say, \aleph B C ll ss (see note at beginning) read, “That is given for you ; do this as my Memorial.” ; (Verse 20) The same MSS., except C, with the ll and s^s read, “And the cup likewise after supper, saying” (s^s adds here, “Take this, divide it among yourselves”) “This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood.” And the same MSS., except s^s, read “That is shed for you.”

It is easy then to see how Dr. Plummer, though he rejects the passage, speaks of “the overwhelming external evidence of almost all MSS. and versions in favour of the words in question.” And, as Dr. Plummer acknowledges that the only first-class MS. which omits the words is D, we see that he has not overstated the external evidence. As it stands, it gives us the full support of \aleph , B, C, and a group of Latin and of Syriac MSS., for the whole of the words concerning the bread, and almost as strong a group for the rest of the passage. One Syriac MS. omits the words “That is shed for you,” and adds “Take this, and divide it among yourselves” : but this omission is as trifling as the authority on which it rests, and can be filled up from St. Paul’s account ; and the addition, which is not of much importance either,

is simply a different form of the later tradition "Take this," "drink ye all of it."

Yet Dr. Wright, WH., Dr. Plummer, and many other authorities omit, and omit with emphasis, these words. Surely there must be a very strong internal case against a passage so forcibly supported by the earliest documentary evidence. Let us see.

ALEX. R. EAGAR.

(*To be continued.*)

LEXICAL NOTES FROM THE PAPYRI.¹

VI.

ἀλόγως.—P^{Fi} 58 (iii/A.D.) ἀλόγως ἐπελθόντες δίχα παντὸς νόμου, a "brutal" assault. (Add to *Notes* v.)

ἀναβολή.—The meaning "bag" is given by the edd. on TbP 413¹⁰ (ii/iii A.D.). (Ditto.)

ἀναγκαῖος.—P Par 46 (ii/B.C.) ἐν τ. ἀναγκαιοτάτοις καιροῖς. The subst.= "calamity" occurs in *Syll.* 255²³ (iii/B.C.) ἐν ἀνάγκαις καὶ κακοπαθλαῖς γένηται. Cf. the elative in BM I. p. 30 (=Witk. 40, ii/B.C.) εἴπερ μὴ ἀναγκαιότερόν σ[ε] περισπᾷ "unless urgent business detains you." P^{Fi} 61¹⁶ (i/A.D.) ἐντυγχάνει σοι τὸ πρῶτον καὶ ἀναγκαιότατον.

ἀνάγνωσις.—The verb is of course extremely common (examples in *Thess.* 81). For the noun cf. TbP 61 (*b*⁴) (ii/B.C.) ἐπὶ τῆς ἀ. τῆς κατὰ φύλλον γεωμετρίας "at the revision of the survey of the crops" (G. and H.), and several instances from iii/A.D. in the normal sense "reading": cf. *Syll.* 552⁸¹ (ii/B.C.). The fact that it was usually reading *aloud* needs keeping in mind: to the exx. for simple "reading" add the early formula ὡς ἂν οὖν ἀναγνώις τὴν ἐπιστολήν, EP 9³ (222 B.C.), and cf. 13³.

¹ For abbreviations see the February *EXPOSITOR*, p. 170. EP = Elephantine Papyri—see footnote below.

ἀναγω.—The use of *ἀνάγω* in Acts xii. 4 finds a ready parallel in *Syll.* 36²⁴ (i/A.D.) *ἀναχθέντα εἰς τὸν δῆμον ἐὰν μὲν πολείτης ᾗ, ἀποξενοῦσθαι*. It means “to import” in *Syll.* 936 *ἀνάγειν τι ἢ πωλεῖν*—a Doric inscription, but suspected of some affectation of antiquity.

ἀναδείκνυμι.—Frequent in the inscriptions in a sacrificial sense, e.g., *Syll.* 553¹⁴ (iii/ii/B.C.) *ἀναδεικνύωσι τῷ Δίῳ (ταῦρον)*.

ἀναδέχομαι.—There is a legal sense in this word which is not uncommon. OP 513⁵⁹ (ii/A.D.) *ἐάν τις ζήτησις περὶ τούτου πρὸς σέ γένηται . . . [ἐγὼ] αὐτὸς τοῦτο ἀναδέχομαι*, “if any action is brought against you . . . with regard to this, I will take the responsibility upon myself” (G. and H.). TbP 98²⁷ (ii/B.C.) *ὧν ἀναδεδέγμεθα* “for whom we are security” (*ibid.*), and so elsewhere. So with infin. in TbP 75⁶ (ii/B.C.) *ἀναδέχομαι δώσιν* “I undertake to give,” HbP 58 (iii/B.C.) *ἀναδέδεκται ἡμῖν ἀπομετρήσειν σῖτον*. The statement (Heb. xi. 17) that Abraham had “undertaken,” “assumed the responsibility of” the promises, would not perhaps be alien to the thought; but the meaning “welcome,” already found in Acts xxviii. 7, is simpler. Cf. *OGIS* 339²⁰ (ii/B.C.) *τὰς πρεσβείας ἀνεδέχετο προθύμως*. *Ibid.* 441⁹ (i/B.C.) *καὶ διὰ ταῦτα κινδύνους πολλοὺς [. . .] ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμετέρων δημοσίων [. . . προθυμό]τατα ἀ[ν]αδεδεγμένους*, if the supplements can be trusted, is a very good parallel. *Syll.* 929³⁰ (ii/B.C.) *πᾶσαν ἀναδεχόμενοι κακοπαθίαν χάριν τοῦ μηθενὸς ὑστερῆσαι δικαίου μηθένα τῶν κρινομένων*, of judges who say they have given not only the day but τὸ πλεῖον τῆς νυκτός to their work. Add *Syll.* 530⁶⁵ (late iv/B.C.)=“undertake”; so EP 29¹² (iii/B.C.), TbP 329¹⁹ (ii/A.D.) etc.

ἀναδίδωμι.—PFi 2²³⁷ (iii/A.D.) *οἱ ἀναδοθέντης*, men whose names had been “sent up”; *ibid.* 25³⁰ (ii/A.D.), of a document, *ἣν καὶ ἀναδέδωκεν εἰς ἀκύρωσιν*. So TbP 397¹³ (198 A.D.). In *Syll.* 279⁷ (ii/B.C.) we find *τό τε ψήφισμα*

ἀνέδωκεν according to the best reading. TbP 448 (ii/iii A.D.) τῷ ἀναδιδόντι σοι τὸ ἐπιστόλιον="the bearer."

ἀναζάω.—See Nägeli 47.

ἀναζητέω.—HbP 71 (iii/B.C.) τὴν πᾶσαν σπουδὴν ποιεῖν ὅπ[ως ἀνα]ζητηθέντες ἀποσταλῶσι "make every effort to search for them," etc., with reference to certain slaves who had deserted. Rein P 17¹² (109 B.C.) has nearly the same phrase: cf. *Syll.* 220¹⁸ (iii/B.C.) *ex suprl.* PFi 83¹² (iii/iv A.D.) ἀναζητηθέντα ἀναπεμφθήσεσθαι πρὸς τὸν κράτιστον ἐπίτροπον. For the noun ἀναζήτησις cf. TbP 423¹² (iii/A.D.).

ἀναζωπυρέω.—LP W (ii/iii A.D.)—an occult pamphlet—αὐτὸ γὰρ ἐστὶν τὸ ἀναζωπυροῦν τὰς πάσας βίβλους: cf. LP V (iii/iv A.D.) δι' οὗ ζωπυρεῖται πάντα πλάσματα.

ἀναθεματίζω.—Deissmann's discovery of this word in the "Biblical Greek" sense, in a source entirely independent of Jewish influence, is a remarkable confirmation of his general thesis; see *ZNTW* ii. 342, and *Proleg.* 46.

ἀναιρέω.—BM III. p. 136⁷ (44 A.D.) ἀντὶ τοῦ τόκου [ὧ]ν ἀνείρηται "the interest on what she has borrowed." *Ibid.* p. 158¹⁷ (212 A.D.) ἀνηρῆσθαι τὸν πωλοῦντα παρὰ τοῦ ὄνουμένου τὴν συνεφωνημένην πρὸς ἀλλήλους τιμήν. TbP 138 (ii/B.C.) ἀνελόμενος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μάχαιραν. FP 100^{19, 26} (99 A.D.) ἀνίρημαι of "receiving" money. For the active, OP 37⁶ (i/A.D.) ἀνείλεν ἀπὸ κοπρίας ἀρρενικὸν σωματίον, "picked up from the gutter a boy foundling" (G. and H.): the corresponding passive about the same transaction in 38⁶. For the meaning "kill" cf. AP 142⁸ (iv/A.D.) βουλόμενοι ἀναιρῆσαί με: in *Syll.* 929⁴⁶ of a city "destroyed." The commercial sense seems the commonest. The compound ἀνταναιρεῖν (cf. ἀνταναπληροῦν) occurs frequently in vol. i. of TbP, as 61b²⁴⁴ ἀνταναιρεθείσης, "subtracted." So PP III. 76 (ii/B.C.), BU 776 (i/A.D.).

ἀναίτιος —*Syll.* 816⁷ (i/A.D.) ἐγχείαντας τὸ ἀναίτιον αἷμα ἀδίκως, *ibid.*¹² ἵνα ἐγδικήσῃς τὸ αἷμα τὸ ἀναίτιον. (This

interesting inscription, containing phrases from the LXX., is given by Dittenberger as of Jewish or Christian origin. The latter alternative is, we fear, too good to be true: there is no sign of the N.T. visible.)

ἀνακαλύπτω.—*Syll.* 803⁶² ἐδόκει αὐταῖ [τὸ ἔσθος ὁ θε]ὸς ἀγκαλύψαι.

ἀνακάμπτω.—In connexion with the metaphorical use in Luke x. 6 we may quote BU 896⁶ (ii/A.D.) πάντα τὰ ἐμὰ ἀνακάμψει εἰς τὴν προγεγραμμ[ένην θυγατέρα]. Cf. Mayser, p. 20.

ἀνάκειμαι.—For the sense *accumbere* (John vi. 11, etc.), which does not seem to be older than the Macedonian period, may be cited BU 344 (ii/iii A.D.), a list of names of οἱ ἀνακείμενοι, and ending γίνονδαι ἄνδρες ἀναγείμενου (!) $\overline{\mu\zeta}$.

ἀνακόπτω.—PFi 36³ (early iv/A.D.) crimes ὑφ' οὐδενὸς ἄλλου ἀνακόπτεται but by the punishment of the criminal. (The word only occurs in a few cursives at Gal. v. 7.)

ἀνακρίνω.—For the judicial sense "examine," as in 1 Corinthians ix. 3, cf. *Syll.* 512⁴⁶ (ii/B.C.) ἀνακρινάντω δὲ καὶ το[ὺ]ς μάρτυρας. The subst. is found in the previous line. So in *OGIS* 374 (i/B.C.) which commemorates a certain Papias, a privy councillor and chief physician of Mithradates Eupator, king of Pontus, τεταγμένον δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνακρίσεων. Dittenberger gives reasons for thinking that "non tam indicem quam inquisitorem hoc significat," one who presided over the examination of men suspected of conspiracy. In TbP 86¹⁻³ (ii/B.C.) we have a man described as ὁ πρὸς ταῖς ἀνακρίσεσσι: the edd. note "This judicial office is not known from other sources." On LpP 4¹⁵ (293 A.D.), where the word follows ἀπογραφή, Mitteis notes that it occurs in BM 251 (II. p. 317), likewise in connexion with the purchase of a slave: "since ἀνάκρισις means a preliminary examination (Voruntersuchung), one thinks of a trial made before the purchase of the slave."

ἀνακύπτω.—Par P 47²³ (ii/B.C.=Witk. 65), a very grandiloquent but ill-spelt letter, will illustrate Luke xxi. 28: οὐκ ἔστι ἀνακύψα<ί με> πόποτε ἐν τῇ Τρικομιά [a village, says Wilcken] ὑπὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης.

ἀναλαμβάνω.—Syll. 329⁴⁹ τοὺς ἀναλαβόντας τὰ ὄπλα. TbP 296⁴⁻¹⁵ (ii/A.D.) has it twice=“receive.” The subst. is found in the same papyrus¹⁹, in the receipt for the purchase of a priestly office, ἐξ ἀναλ(ήψεως) ἐν αὐτῷ “as payable by himself” (G. and H.). In Syll. 418³⁶ (iii/A.D.)=“entertainment.” BM III. p. 219 (ii/A.D.) has ἀναλημπθῆναι and the noun ἀναλήμπτες in a very illiterate document.

ἀναλίσκω.—P Par 49¹⁹ (ii/B.C.=Witk. 46) μηδὲ ἀναλίσκειν χαλκοῦς, and so often. Notice ἀναλουμένων in same sense BM III. 181¹¹ (ii/A.D.). (There seems no fatal reason against making this verb an early compound of *ῥαλίσκω*, whose simplex survives in the passive ἀλίσκομαι: the *ā* is due to contraction of -*aῤa*- after loss of digamma. The meaning *destroy* is therefore parallel with the same sense in ἀναιρέω.)

ἀναλογία.—The verb is found in AP 64¹³ (107 A.D.) μὴ ἀναλογοῦντας τὴν ἐ[π]ιμέλειαν, which the edd. translate “incapable of doing their duties.” For the noun a iii/A.D. citation may be made from PFi 50¹⁵ κατὰ τὸ ἥμισυ κατ’ ἀναλογίαν τῶν φοινίκων (once πρὸς ἄ.) “proportionately.”

ἀναλύω.—For the intr. meaning “depart” (Polybius and later), cf. Par P 15²⁹ (120 B.C.) οἰομένων ἐφ’ ἱκανὸν χρόνον καταφθαρέντα με ἐντεῦθεν ἀναλύσειν: *ibid.* 22²⁹ (ii/B.C.) ἀποσυλήσας ἡμᾶς ἀνέλυσε: BM I. p. 34 (161 B.C.) μετὰ κραυγῆς τε διαστελλομένου μεθ’ ἡσυχίας ἀναλύειν. For the meaning “die” Nägeli, p. 34, cites the memorial inscription IGSI 1794² (Rom.), καὶ πῶς μοι βεβίωται καὶ πῶς ἀνέλυσα μαθήσ[η]; cf. *ibid.* 159 ἀναλύειν τὸν βίον.

ἀναμιμνήσκω.—Syll. 256²⁶ (ii/B.C.) ἀναμιμ]νησκόμενοι πατρίων.

ἀνάμνησις.—*Syll.* 929¹⁰⁶ (ii/B.C.) ὧν ἀνά(μνη)σιν [. . .] (ἐπ)οιοῦντο.

ἀνανεόω.—*Syll.* 481¹⁰ (iii/ii B.C.) τὰ τε ἐξ ἀρχῆς οἰκεῖα ὑπάρ[χοντα Σελευκεῦσι]ν ἐκ προγόνων ἀνενεώσατο. So *ibid.* 484 (iii/B.C.), 654 (? ii/B.C.). Cf. the subst. in *PFi* 1⁶ (ii/A.D.) μὴ προσδεόμενοις ἀνανεώσεως, a renewal of legal powers hereby conferred: so 81¹¹ (103 A.D.).

ἀναντιρήτως.—So spelt in *OGIS* 335¹²⁸ (ii/i B.C.), with the meaning “beyond possibility of dispute.”

ἀνάξιος.—*Str P* 5 (iii/A.D.) ἀνάξια [τ]ῆς ὑπὸ σοῦ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν πρυτανευομένης εἰρή[ν]ης ὁ πρεσβύτης παθών.

ἀναπαύω.—The verb is a technical term of agriculture in *TbP* 105 (ii/B.C.) to “rest” land by sowing light crops upon it; cf. *BM II.* p. 189 f. σπείρων . . . ἀρ[ούρ]ας δυὸ ἀπὸ νότου ἀναπαύμεσι γέ[νε]σι with Kenyon’s note, and especially the full discussion by Wilcken, *Archiv* i. 157 f. Land thus “rested” was ἐν ἀναπαύματι *TbP* 61 (ii/B.C.), or could be called ἀνάπαυμα itself, as *FP* 112 (i/A.D.). In *PFi* 57⁵⁶ (iii/A.D.) and 91³ (ii/A.D.) ἀνάπαυσις and ἀναπαύω are used with τῶν λειτουργιῶν of “relief” from public duties.

ἀναπέμπω.—“To send up to a higher authority” is the meaning in *Syll.* 177^{51 f. 107} (iii/B.C. end), *OGIS* 194²⁸ (i/B.C.), 329⁵¹ (ii/B.C.), *TbP* 7 (ii/B.C.), *Hb P* 57 (iii/B.C.), *FP* 37 (iii/A.D.), *TbP* 594 (*ibid.*), a warrant for arrest, *al.*; see Deissmann *BS* 229, also *Archiv* iii. 74.

ἀναπληρόω.—*OGIS* 56⁴⁶ (238 B.C.) ὅπως ἅπαντες εἰδῶσιν διότι τὸ ἐνλείπον πρότερον (as to the calendar) διωρθῶσθαι καὶ ἀναπεπληρῶσθαι συμβέβηκεν διὰ τῶν Εὐεργετῶν θεῶν: the first word describes *correction*, the second *intercalation*. On *Par, P* 62^{v.3} (ii/B.C.) τοῖς ἀναπληρώσουσιν τὰς ὥνας δοθήσεται ὀψώνια, ἐάνπερ ἐκπληρώσουσιν, “those who complete the contracts,” see Wilcken, *Ostraka* i. 532 f., who explains the ὀψώνια (against Grenfell) as a commission of 10 per cent. The noun occurs in *BM III.* p. 168 (B.C. 6) εἰς ἀναπλήρωσιν

τιμῆς. The verb is found in PP III. 54 (Philadelphus) ἀναπληρούτωσα[ν], but with a hiatus both before and after : cf. also *Syll.* 510⁶² (ii/B.C.) τ. γενόμενον διάπτωμα ἀναπληρούτωσαν. In P. Lille 8 (iii/A.D.) a petitioner demands the restoration of certain cattle that had been taken from him, that he may “make up” his rent—ὅ]πως δύνωμαι ἀναπληροῦν τὰ ἐ[κ]φόρια τῆς γῆς.

ἀνασεύω.—In TbP 28²⁰ (ii/B.C.) the passive means “to be incited, stirred up” to do service to the Government—a curious contrast to its normal connotation. For the literal meaning see *Syll.* 789³⁶ (iv/B.C.).

ἀνασκευάζω.—OP 745 (1 A.D.) μὴ . . . πάλιν ἑατοὺς ἀνασκευάζωμεν μὴ οὔσης χρήας, “and we go bankrupt again without any necessity” (G. and H.). This really involves the meaning “subvert” found in Acts xv. 24, drawn from the military sense, to “plunder, dismantle” a town.

ἀνασπάω.—In TbP 420²⁶ (iii/A.D.) ἀνασπασθῇ is used with regard to the “pulling up (?)” of barley, with which the edd. compare BU 1041⁸ ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἀνεσπασθη σου ἡ κριθὴ ἀρτ[ά]β[αι] ιε.

ἀνάστασις.—The word occurs several times in inscriptions of ii/A.D. with the sense “erection” of a monument, see *Notes* ii. p. 108; add *Magn.* 179²⁸¹, 193, *Syll.* 324⁸, 342⁴⁸ (both i/B.C.) *al.*, and for the verb *Syll.* 656, 686 (both ii/A.D.) *al.* So still in iii/A.D., BU 362^{vii.3}, the “setting up” of the statue of Severus. The narrative of Acts xvii. prepares us for the total novelty of the meaning “resurrection”: it was a perfectly natural use of the word, but the idea was new, and the term had to be new also.

ἀναστατόω.—“Nowhere in profane authors,” says Grimm. Its place in the vernacular is proved, however, with singular decisiveness by a private letter almost contemporary with the Biblical citations, BU 1079²⁰ (41/A.D.) μὴ ἵνα ἀναστατώσης ἡμᾶς, and later by the famous schoolboy’s letter, OP

119¹⁰ (ii/iii A.D.) ἀναστατοῖ με—ἄρρον (= ἄρον) αὐτόν, “he quite upsets me—off with him” (Blass): cf. also Str P 5¹⁶ (iii/A.D.) ἀν[άσ]τατον τὸν πρεσβύτην πεποίηνται.

ἀναστρέφομαι.—Deissmann (*BS* 88, 194) illustrates the meaning “behave,” which Grimm compared with the moral signification of 𐤀𐤋𐤍 “walk.” As his examples are entirely from Pergamus, we may add others to show that it was no local peculiarity. *Syll.* 521⁹⁵ (190 B.C.) τοῖς καλῶς καὶ εὐσεβῶς ἀναστραφεῖσιν (Athens). *OGIS* 48⁹ (iii/B.C.), ὁρῶντές τινας τῶν πολιτῶν μὴ ὀρθῶς ἀνα[στρ]ε[φ]ομένους καὶ θόρυβον οὐ τὸν τυχόντα παρ[έχ]οντας, is an early example from Egypt. (Dittenberger’s index has “ἀναστροφή, *passim*.”) AP 131 (early ii/A.D.) has ἀ. περί in the sense “attend to.” FP 12⁶ (103 B.C.) τῶν . . . οὐ ἀπὸ τοῦ βελτίστου ἀναστρεφόμενων, “being of the less reputable class” (G. and H.). In OP 237^{11.23} (ii/A.D.) μεταπαθῶς ἀναστραφ[έν]τα is translated “being sympathetically disposed”; but OP 71^{11.12} (303 A.D.) μὴ ὀρθῶς ἀναστραφέντες is “behaved dishonestly.”

ἀνατίθεμαι.—Note perf. act. ἀνατέθηκα in *Syll.* 604¹⁰ (Pergamon, end of iii/B.C.). The active=“dedicate” of course occurs everywhere. The late sense “impart, communicate,” found in the two N.T. occurrences of the word, seems to appear in Par P 69D²³ (iii/A.D.) . . .] ἀναθέμενοι τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀκ[έραιον].

ἀνατολή.—*OGIS* 199³² (i/A.D.) has ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς opposed to ἀπὸ δύσεως, *east* to *west*; in 225 (iii/B.C.) it is ἀπὸ ἡλίου ἀνατολῶν. Cf. *Syll.* 740²⁵ (212 A.D.). The Calendar in HbP 27⁴⁵ (iii/B.C.) has πρὸς τὰς δόσεις (= δύσεις) καὶ ἀ[να]τολὰς τῶν ἄστρον, and in TbP 276²⁸ (ii/iii A.D.) the word is applied to the “rising” of Venus. Time, instead of point of compass, is indicated in OP 725¹² (ii/A.D.) ἀπὸ ἀν[ατολῆς] ἡ[λίου] μέχρι δύσεως: a nearly identical phrase in the “shorter conclusion” of Mark presumably has the other meaning.

ἀνατρέπω.—With the phrase in Titus i. 11 we may com-

pare Par P 63³⁵ (ii/B.C.) τῆς πατρικῆς οἰκίας . . . ἔτι ἔνπροσθεν ἄρδην [ἀ]νατετραμμένης δι' ἀσ[ω]τίας.

ἀναφέρω is used of "transference" from a village-prison to the prison of the metropolis in P Lille 7¹⁷ (iii/A.D.) νυνὶ δὲ ἀνενήνοχέν με εἰς τὸ ἐν Κροκοδίλων πό(λει) δεσμωτήριον. It occurs in connexion with the payment of moneys in TbP 296¹³, 315³⁵ (both ii/A.D.). Its legal sense is fully discussed by Deissmann *BS* 88. Add miscellaneous occurrences in *Syll.* 588¹¹⁵ (ii/B.C.), 813¹¹ (see note), 814⁸; BM III. p. 195²¹ (iii/A.D.); Rein P 26¹⁴ (104 B.C.).

ἀναχρονίζω in the sense of χρονίζω occurs in the illiterate TbP 413¹⁴ (ii/iii A.D.) ἀ. σοι πέμποντες ἐπιστόλια, "we are late in sending you letters" (G. and H.). The papyrus has other examples of the tendency of uneducated persons to use compounds: New Testament critics may remember this when they assume the *littérateur's* hand in some of St. Luke's "emendations" (?) of Q.

ἀναχωρέω.—The subst. is used of the "falling" of the river in PP II. 13 (19)⁶ (iii/B.C.=Witk. 16) ἀνα[χώ]ρησιν τοῦ ποταμοῦ. On BU 447⁷⁶ (ii/A.D.) see Wilcken *Ostr.* i. 648. In TbP 353⁶ (ii/A.D.) ἀπ' ἀναχωρήσεως κατισεληλυθώς it has the sense of "absence." For the verb—"withdraw" see *Syll.* 802¹¹⁷ (iii/B.C.) τοῦτο ποιήσας εἰς τὸ ἄβατον ἀνεχώρησε.

ἀνάψυξις.—In BM I. p. 30 (172 B.C.=Witk. 39) we have an urgent appeal to a man who has become a monk in the Serapeum: his wife writes δοκοῦσα νῦν γε σοῦ παραγενομένου τεύξεσθαί τινος ἀναψυχῆς. See Witkowski's note: the same form (classical) is found in P. Vat A (168 B.C.,=Witk. 41).

ἀνδρίζομαι.—PP II 40(a)¹² (iii/B.C.,=Witk. 26) μὴ οὖν ὀλιγοψυχήσητε, ἀλλ' ἀνδρίζεσθε—a good parallel to 1 Cor. xvi. 13.

ἀνέγκλητος.—The word occurs often in inscriptions: cf. the index to *Syll.*

ἀνέκλειπτος.—In *OGIS* 383⁷⁰ (i/B.C.) Antiochus of Com-

magene declares *θεραπείαν τε ἀνέγλειπτον καὶ ἱερεῖς ἐπιλέξας σὺν πρεπούσαις ἐσθῆσι Περσικῶι γένει κατέστησα*. In BM III. p. 105⁷ (42 A.D.) contractors undertake to provide *τὰ καύματα ἀνέγλειπτα* for a bath during the current year.

ἀνεκτός.—Cf. the dialect inscription *Syll.* 793—*si vera lect.* (see note).

ἄνεμος.—To Deissmann's example (*BS* 248) for *ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων* add *PFi* 50¹⁰⁴ (iii/A.D.). The same use of *ἄνεμος* is implied in *PFi* 20¹⁰ (128 A.D.) *ἐξ οὗ ἐὰν αἰρήται ἀνέμου*: Vitelli compares Catullus 26⁵. In *OP* 100¹⁰ (133 A.D.), a declaration regarding a sale of land, we find *ὧν ἡ τοποθεσία καὶ τὸ κατ' ἄνεμον διὰ τῆς καταγραφῆς δεδήλωται*, where the edd. understand by *τὸ κατ' ἄνεμον* the boundaries on the four sides.

ἀνεξίκακος.—In *TbP* 272¹⁹ (a medical fragment, dated late in ii/A.D.) we have a literary citation for the word: *εἰ γὰρ ἀ. ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ὧν μὴ ὑπομένοι τὸ δίψ[ος]*, "for if he has general endurance" (G. and H.).

ἀνέρχομαι, of "going up" to the capital, is illustrated by the illiterate *TbP* 412⁸ (late ii/A.D.) *ἀνελθε εἰς τὴν μητρόπολιν τοῦ νέου ἔτους ἐπὶ καὶγὼ ἀνέρχομε εἰς τὴν πόλιν*. So 411⁶ (ii/A.D.) *αὐτῇ ὥρᾳ ἀνελθε* "come up instantly, for his highness the epistrategus has made several inquiries for you" (G. and H.); and *BM*. III. p. 210^{3,5} (iii/A.D.) *ἀνερχέστω*. Other citations are needless.

ἄνεσις.—See *Thess.* 89, and add *Syll.* 533¹⁶ (iii/A.D. *init.*), 932^{5,3} (*ibid.*), of "relief" from taxation.

ἀνετάζω.—In *OP* 34^{1,13} (127 A.D.) a prefect uses this word in directing Government clerks whose business it was to "examine" documents and glue them into *τόμοι*. This is a word "not found in profane authors" (Grimm).

ἄνευ.—*P Par* 45⁴ (ii/B.C., = *Witk.* 60) *ἄνευ τῶν θεῶν οὐθὲν γίνεται*. Quotations are hardly needed. See Wilcken, *Ostr.* i. 559 f.

ἀνευρίσκω.—*Syll.* 154 *bis* (late iv/B.C.), 803²⁶ (iii/B.C.).

ἀνέχω.—Str P 22²³ (ii/A.D.) *σιωπήσαντος τοῦ νομίζοντος αὐτῷ διαφέρειν καὶ ἀνασχομένου ὑπὲρ δεκαετίαν* (a statute of limitations comes in). NP 76¹⁴, LP 5^{11.8} (iii./A.D.), 55¹¹ (iv/A.D.). The word is not common in early papyri. Cf. Crönert, *Mem.* 207.

ἀνεψιός.—TbP 323, FP 99, OP 99, BM III. p. 167, etc.

ἄνηθον.—*Syll.* 804²⁶ (perhaps ii/A.D.) ἄ. μετ' ἐλαίου, for headache.

ἀνήκω.—The Biblical meaning “to be due” seems not to be illustrated from outside this literature; it is, however, very common. *OGIS* 532¹⁷ (3 B.C.), the Paphlagonians' oath of allegiance to Augustus, has the undertaking [παν]τὶ τρόπῳ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐκείνοις ἀνηκό[ντων] (for the rights of Augustus and his heirs) πάντα κίνδυνον ὑπομενεῖν. The index gives other examples of this use, which is found in 1 and 2 Maccabees. FP 94 (iii/A.D.) has twice περὶ τῶν [τῇ ἐπιτροπείᾳ] ἀνηκόντων, as the edd. restore it, “his duties in the period of guardianship, functions pertaining to it.” TbP 6⁴¹ (ii/B.C.) τῶν ἀνηκόντων τοῖς ἱερο[ῖς κομ]ίζεσθαι, “the dues which belong to the temples”: it is unfortunately not clear whether the infin. depends on ἀνηκόντων or on the main verb προστετάχαμεν. TbP 43²⁵ (ii/B.C.) ἐν τοῖς ὑμῖν ἀνήκουσι, “in your interests.” It is needless to quote for the common meaning “pertain,” which is found as late as vi/A.D. (OP 140).

ἀνθίστημι.—PP II. 37 (a fragment) οὐ γὰρ δύναμαι ἀνθ[ι]στάνειν.

ἀνθομολογέομαι.—OP 743³⁴ (and ⁴⁰) (2 B.C., =Witk. 96) ὥς ἀνθομολογη(σομένῳ) ὑπὲρ σου οὕτως ὥς ὑπ(έρ) μου, where the edd. render “as he will agree in everything for you just as for me,” and compare TbP 21⁶, Par P 42⁷: add TbP 410¹⁴ (16 A.D.) [ἀνθο]μολογήσεται περὶ τῆς σπ[ο]υδῆς “he may answer to me for your activity.” In GH 71^{11.14} (iii/A.D.) the active appears with the meaning “acknow-

ledge, formally admit" the correctness of a legal form TbP 410¹⁴ (16 A.D.) ἵνα . . . [ἀνθο]μολογήσῃται περὶ τῆς σπουδῆς is translated by the edd. "may answer to me for your activity."

ἀνθραξ.—PP III. 107 (*d*), BM III. 113 (ii/A.D.), FP 348 (ii/iii A.D.).

ἀνθρώπινος.—This significant adj. is found in *Ostr.* 1218 (Rom.) μέλη ἰα<τρ>ικὰ ἀνθρώπι<να>, with reference apparently to certain healing charms. In wills of the Ptolemaic period ἀνθρώπινόν τι πάσχειν is the stereotyped form for "to die," e.g. PP I. 11 ἐὰν δὲ τι ἀνθρώπινον πάθω καταλείπω κ.τ.λ.: cf. also the important marriage contract NP 21¹⁵. (ii/B.C.) ἐὰν δὲ τις αὐτῶν ἀνθρώπινόν τι πάθῃ καὶ τελευτήσῃ κ.τ.λ. So TbP 333 (iii/A.D.); *Syll.* 633¹³ (Rom.—πάσχη).

ἀνίημι.—PP III. 53 (*p*) ἀνείεταί λοιπογραφεῖσθαι "he is permitted to remain in arrears." *Syll.* 552^{29, 59} (late ii/B.C.) of schoolboys "let off" ἐκ τῶν μαθημάτων. AP 99⁹ (ii/A.D.) ἀνιμένη "dedicated land." OP 471⁸⁶ (ii/A.D.) γέλωτα πολὺν καὶ ἀνειμένον. *Ibid.* 503¹⁸ ἀνεῖναι "to admit." *Ibid.* 533¹⁰ (ii/iii A.D.) ἐὰν ἀνεθῶσι "if they are neglected." GH 78¹⁹ (307 A.D.) ἀξιῶ . . . ἀνεθῆναι "released."

ἀνίστημι.—AP 68⁴³ (late in i/A.D.) has ἀρούρας . . . ὑπὸ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν πρὸς χρεῖαις διὰ τῶν λόγων ἀνασταθείσας="reported," or the like. The transitive tenses are common in the sense of "setting up" a statue.

ἀνοίγω.—*Syll.* 790⁴⁷ (i/A.D.) τὰς σφραγίδας ἀνοιξάτω. In two illiterate papyri of ii/B.C., written by the same hand, we find the forms ἀνύγω (Par P 51) and ἀνύγετε (Par P 50): see Mayser 110. So also TbP 383²⁹ (46 A.D.) (the entrance and exit) εἰς ἣν καὶ ἀνύξει ἑαυτῇ . . . θύραν.

ἀνοιξίς.—BM I. p. 73 (magical papyrus of iv/A.D.).

ἀνοικοδομέω.—In BM III. p. 1² (iii/B.C.), a complaint is lodged against a neighbour who has "built" (ἀνοικοδόμηκεν) a staircase in a mutual courtyard, and thereby caused some

injury to the petitioner. In *Syll.* 220¹² (iii/B.C.), καὶ τῶν τειχῶν τῶν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ πεπτωκότων συνεπεμελήθη ὅπως ἀνοικοδομηθεῖ, the meaning is “rebuild.”

ἄνομος.—OP 237^{vii. 11} (Dionysia, ii/A.D.) ἀνόμου κατοχῆς “an illegal claim.” BM II. p. 172 (ii/A.D.) ἄνομα καὶ ἄδικα (conduct of persons complained of). For the noun may be cited Par P 14²⁷ (ii/B.C.) they assaulted me ἀφορήτῳ ἀνομίᾳ ἐξενεχθέντες. The verb is used in the passive Par P 37⁴⁸ (ii/B.C.) ἀξιῶ . . . μὴ ὑπεριδεῖν με ἡνομημένον καὶ ἐγκεκλειμένον: *ibid.* 35³⁴ (by same writer) has the same combination in the present.

ἀνταποδίδωμι.—Par P 34²² (ii/B.C.) χαλκίαν τηροῦντες ἀν[τ]απ[ο]δώσωσι.

ἀντέχομαι.—For the New Testament sense “hold firmly to” see note in *Thess.* I. v. 14. The verb is very common in petitions, as implying that, notwithstanding the course taken, other claims are not lost sight of: e.g. OP 282 (30–35 A.D.) τῶν μὲν γὰρ ἄλλων τῶν ὄντων μο[ι] πρ[ὸς] αὐτὴν ἀνθόξομα[ι] (sc. ἀντέχομαι) κα[ὶ] ἀνθέξομαι “this petition is without prejudice to the other claims which I have or may have against her” (G. and H.). The same combination of tenses in PFi 86²⁸ (i/A.D.): see also 51²². In TbP 309²¹ (ii/A.D.) ἀντεχόμενοι καὶ ἑτέροις μεταμισθοῦντες is rendered “resuming the land and leasing it to others” (*id.*).

ἀντί.—For the simple ἀντί=“over against,” “opposite” Wackernagel (*Hellenistica* 5) cites IG II 835 c⁶⁸ (iv/B.C.) ἀ[σ]πίδες τρεῖς, ἐν αἷς ἔνι ἱππεὺς καὶ ὀπλίτης κ[αὶ] Θησεὺς ἀντὶ τοῦ Μινωταύρου. The ordinary meaning “instead of” needs no citations. *Syll.* 740⁵ (iii./A.D.) ἀ. πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ὧν εὐεργετήθη παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, “in return for many blessings.” BM III. p. 177 (B.C. 8) τιμῇ(ς) οἴνου ἀντὶ τῆς ε “wine for the 5th day.” *Ostr.* 1135 (iii/A.D.) ἀντὶ κριθῆς “paid for barley”—ὑπέρ is usual in this sense. TbP 376¹⁵

(ii/A.D.), διαμισθώσεως ἀντὶ τῶν . . . ἐκφορίων, “joint leasing out *at* the rent” (G. and H.) is the same thing.

ἀντιβάλλω.—The subst. ἀντιβλήματα is found in OP 498¹⁶ (ii/A.D.), a contract with stone-cutters, where the edd. understand it of small stones used to insert in vacant places between larger ones.

ἀντίδικος.—For this legal word it is sufficient to refer to the interesting lawsuit regarding the identity of a child, which recalls so vividly 1 Kings iii. 16 ff.: the prosecuting advocate states that his client had put the foundling in the defendant’s charge—τοῦτο ἐνεχείρισεν τῇ ἀντιδίκῳ (OP 37¹⁸—49 A.D.).

ἀντίθεσις.—The adj. is used in a report of ii/B.C. regarding the peculations of certain officials, TbP 24⁶³, one of the charges against them being that they had “wormed themselves” (αὐτοὺς ἐνειληκότων) into certain positions ἀντιθέταις τῆς καθ’ ἑαυτοὺς ἀσχολία<ς> “inconsistent with their own work” (G. and H.).

ἀντικαθίστημι.—OP 97⁹ (ii/A.D.).

ἀντίκειμαι.—Par P 45⁶ (ii/B.C., =Witk. 60) Μενέδημον ἀντικείμενον ἡμῖν.

ἄντικρυς.—With the use in Acts xx. 15 cf. OP 43 verso^{III.20} (iii/A.D.) καταμένων ἄντικρυς οἰκίας Ἐπιμάχου. TbP 395⁴ (ii/A.D.) ἄντικρυς Τυχαίου “opposite the temple of Fortune” (G. and H.). BM III. p. 233⁸ καὶ κατ’ ἀντικρὺ[. . . (iv/A.D.) is before a hiatus.

ἀντιλαμβάνομαι.—The verb is found in the general sense of “lay hold of,” “undertake,” in BM II. p. 256 (ii/A.D.) ὁμνύω . . . ἀντιλήμψασθαι (= -εσθαι) τῆς χρείας. So PFi 47 (217 A.D.) ἐντεῦθεν δὲ ἑκάτερον ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι καὶ χρᾶσθαι καὶ οἰκονομῖν καὶ διοικεῖν. Rein P 47⁴ (ii/A.D.) τῆς] γ[εωρ]γίας ἀ. BU 462¹⁸ (ii/A.D.) of men who “hold” land. BU 531²² (ii/A.D.) to “set to” the vintage. TbP 393 (ii/A.D.) *al.* From this come two derived senses, of which only the first is repre-

sented in the New Testament, (1) "aid," "succour" of a friend, (2) "seize" of an opponent. Good examples of (1) are PP II 3 (iii/B.C.) σὺ δὲ ἀφιλοτίμως μου ἀντιλαμβάνη, G 30¹⁶ (ii/B.C., =Witk. 83) ἐφ' οἷς ἂν οὖν ὑμῶν προσδέωνται ἀντιλαμβανόμενοι, and the expressive double compound in HbP 82¹⁷ (iii/B.C.) καλῶς οὖν ποιήσεις συναν[τι]λ[α]μβανόμενος προθύμως περὶ τῶν εἰς ταῦτα συγκυρόντων "please therefore to give your zealous co-operation in all that concerns this" (G. and H.). Cf. *OGIS* 697¹ (a Roman inscription from Egypt, on the graves of murdered men) ἀντιλα(β)οῦ, κύριε Σάραπι. Dittenberger quotes FP 12²⁴ (103 B.C.) τούτων δὲ γενομένων ἔσομαι ἀντειλημμένος, the passive. In *OGIS* 51^{9,10} (iii/B.C.) καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν ἐκάστου καὶ κατὰ κοινὸν πάντων ἀντιλαμβάνεται must have the same sense. *Ibid.* 339²² (ii/B.C.) shows gen. of thing, τῆς τε ἄλλης εὐσχημοσύνης τῆς κατὰ τὸ γυμνάσιον ἀντελάβετο. For (2), where the meaning is *in malam partem*, see such passages as BU 648 (ii/A.D.) βιαίως ἀντιλαμβάνονται τοῦ πατρικοῦ μου μέρους, BM III. p. 135 (ii/A.D.) βιαίως ἀντέλαβον τὸ τῆς γῆς: other examples in Gradenwitz, *Einführung*, i. p. 18.

ἀντιλέγω.—*Syll.* 540⁴³ (ii/B.C.) ἐὰν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀντιλέγωσιν: so in 523²¹ (iii/B.C.).

ἀντίλημψις.—The *μ* begins to invade the noun even in the earlier documents (cf. *Proleg.* 56). BM I. p. 38 (158 B.C.) ἥς ἔχετε πρὸς πάντας . . . ἀντιλήμψεως, and the same phrase in TbP 43 (118 B.C.); cf. G. 15 (ii/B.C.). FP 296 (ii/A.D.), TbP 283 *fin.* (i/B.C.). See further Deissmann *BS* 92, 223.

ἀντιλογία.—The disputed meaning of opposition in *act* (see Thayer) finds fresh confirmation in PP II. 17 (3) (iii/B.C.) where ἀντιλογίαν γενομένην Ἀτταλῶι refers to an "assault." The word is fairly common meaning "quarrel," as G 38⁸ (ii/i/B.C.) ἀντιλογίαν πρὸς με συστησάμενος. TbP 138 (i/B.C.). So in the formula ἄνευ (χωρὶς) πάσης ἀντιλογίας "without dispute," in formal promises to pay money, etc. ;

BM II. p. 208 (ii/A.D.), *Ostr.* 1151 (iii/A.D.), PFi 43 (iv/A.D.), *ibid.* 94 (v/A.D.). Cf. *Syll.* 929¹¹⁵ (ii/B.C.) ὑπ' οὐδενὸς ἀντιλογίας, *ibid.* 334^{4: 32} (i/B.C.).

ἀντιλοιδорέω.—PP III 21(g)²⁰ (late iii/B.C.) ἐμοῦ δέ σε ἀντιλοιδοροῦντος follows ἐλοιδόρησας φαμένη etc.

ἀντλέω.—BM III. p. 183⁶⁶ (113 A.D.) ἀντλούντων ἀπὸ πρωίας ἕως ὀψέ. The subst. ἀντλητής occurs in the same papyrus, and in TbP 241 (i/B.C.). For the compound ἀναντλέω used metaphorically see P Vat A (ii/B.C., =Witk. 41) τοιούτους καιροὺς ἀνηντληκυῖα.

ἀντοφθαλμέω.—The word occurs in the printed text of Par P 63, but is removed by Mahaffy.

ἀνυδρος.—PP II 9 (2) (iii/B.C.) δία τὴν ἀνυδρίαν τῶν τόπων—in the petition of the quarrymen referred to above.

ἄνω.—PP II. 33 (a steward's account) ἄρτων τῶν ἀποσταλέντων σοι ἄνω. OP 744 (i/B.C., =Witk. 98) ἀποστελῶ σε ἄνω "I will send it up to you" (from Alexandria): on σέ= σοί cf. *Proleg.* 64. The superl. occurs in BM III. p. 107(c)¹¹ (42 A.D.) τῇ ἀνωτάτῳ χρήσομαι τειμωρίᾳ.

JAMES HOPE MOULTON.

GEORGE MILLIGAN.

OPERA FORIS:

MATERIALS FOR THE PREACHER.

III.

Acts xii. 17, and xxviii. 30–31.

Both Peter and Paul drop out of Acts suddenly. The reader would have liked to know what became of them, but Luke apparently has no interest in recording the close of their career. Peter *departed and went into another place.*

Paul taught for two years in Rome, *no man forbidding him*. And that is all. Evidently Luke's concern with both apostles was not biographical. His aim was to depict the expansion of the gospel from Jerusalem to Rome, and with the record of that his work is done. Hence, while we learn incidentally of the death of Herod the persecutor, there is not a syllable about the death of Peter or of Paul within his pages. As Harnack observes, in a recent essay on *Die Zeitangaben in der Apostelgeschichte des Lukas* (p. 23),¹ "Soli deo gloria! What Luke is occupied with is not Peter or Paul, but the divine process of impenitence on the part of the Jews and of gospel-preaching to the Gentiles throughout Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, and then Rome, as well as the receptivity wrought by God among the Gentiles for this message. *Αὐτοὶ καὶ ἀκούσονται.*" When Luke wrote, they *were* hearing in still greater numbers throughout the empire. The earlier workmen had been buried, but God's work was going on.

The glad cadence of the last four words of Acts (*μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας ἀκωλύτως*) and the dramatic position of the closing adverb justify Harnack's remarks, in another essay (*Lukas der Arzt*, p. 116, Eng. trans. pp. 163 f.), upon the undaunted optimism of the book. "What a trumpet-note of joy and courage and victory resounds from the first page to the last of the Lucan history! *Vexilla regis prodeunt!* We listen in vain for this note in the other evangelists. They are all burdened with a far more heavy load of cares, ideas, and doctrines than this Greek enthusiast of Christ, who strides forward bravely surmounting every difficulty." The full significance of *ἀκωλύτως* is seen in the light of a passage like Luke xi. 52, where the writer has substituted *ἐκωλύσατε* for Matthew's *οὐκ ἀφίετε* in Christ's word upon the scribes,

¹ Reprinted from the *Sitzungsberichte der königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* (Berlin, 1907).

or νομίκοι, who 'prevented other people from entering the kingdom.

* * * * *

Galatians ii. 10 : *Only they would that we should remember the poor : the same which I also was forward to do.* Is it fanciful to imagine that a touch of quiet irony lies in Paul's account of the last injunctions given to him at Jerusalem ? As if he was likely to forget the claims of poor people, amid ecclesiastical and doctrinal discussions ! Surely they might have taken that for granted. The authorities, no doubt, meant well. But, says Paul gravely, I did not need any prompting in that direction ; ὁ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι. This does not mean that Paul then and there began to make it his object to collect for the poor, although doubtless he did use the " collection for the poor saints in Judea " as a means of drawing together happily the two sides of the Church. He needed no official reminder of his Christian duty to the poor. Whoever might be lacking, he at least (so the change from μνημονεύωμεν to ἐσπούδασα may suggest) was not likely to be backward in this service.

One of the highest forms in which we can show our appreciation of a man's proved character is to take for granted that he will do some duty. We should assume that he will be ready for it. To remind him nervously of its obligation is, in one aspect, to indicate that we are not quite sure of him. Perhaps he may forget it, in the press of other interests ! Let us charge him ! Paul relates the exhortation, as he probably received it, with perfect courtesy. But one can imagine how he felt ; not irritated—he was far too great a man for that—but half-amused, as many a person is who has to receive gratuitous advice, by mouth or letter, from well-meaning outsiders, upon the cardinal tasks which all the while lie closest to his own heart. He listens to the counsel, and then quietly

goes his way, wondering what his friends take him for, after all, wondering whether they really thought that he needed at this time of day to be prodded to his duty.

* * * * *

Galatians ii. 14: *But when I saw*, and Acts xvii. 23: *As I beheld*. At Antioch and at Athens Paul's great, though perhaps not very welcome, service was that he detected the misdirection of religious energy. He believed in the charity which thought no evil, but he did not conceive this to mean an amiable habit of shutting one's eyes to inconsistencies and aberrations in human conduct. Things were going wrong at Antioch, although the local Christians either failed to realize it or were too timid to protest. Paul's keen penetration and courage saved the situation for Christendom. *When I saw . . . I said*. It was a time for plain speech, when issues had to be disentangled and principles cleared from any deviating practices. The Christians at Antioch were, like Christian and Hopeful in Bunyan's allegory, "at a place where they saw a way put itself into their way, and seemed withal to lie as straight as the way which they should go." They had been persuaded to deviate along this path, but no one realized it till Paul arrived. *I saw ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσιν* "that they were not on the straight path." For the sake of their own peace as well as for the sake of their followers, he spoke out, impelled by the same motive as at Athens, where among the pagans he seems to have also felt urged by a sense, half of indignation, half of pity, at the misapplication of human reverence and earnestness. *I beheld . . . I now declare to you*. The sight of religious feeling running to waste, through confused and imperfect knowledge, always stirred Paul. Inside the Church and outside the Church, he was confronted with the pathos and mischief of this problem, and to it he brought the courage of

his own convictions and the impact of his own practical¹ sagacity, exposing the error ere it was too late.

JAMES MOFFATT.

*NOTES AND APPRECIATIONS OF RECENT
FOREIGN THEOLOGY.*

IN the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* of July 6, Harnack joins issue with Blass on the question of the Bezan Recension of Acts. In a monograph entitled, *Professor Harnack und die Schriften des Lukas*, Blass reiterates his theory that both editions are the work of Luke himself. He bases his arguments almost entirely on grammatical and linguistic grounds, and claims that there is a striking unity of expression and style between the canonical work and the alterations peculiar to Codex D.

Harnack evidently feels that the credit of the linguistic and grammatical method he has himself adopted in determining the unity of the "we" passages with the rest of the narrative in our canonical text, is somewhat endangered by its wider application in Blass's work. He contends that in D, the points of likeness are to be explained as imitations and adaptations of the style of Luke by an educated redactor. The weak joint in Blass's armour is discovered in his rejection of numerous varieties of reading in D, which he, quite arbitrarily it would seem, regards as imitations of a scribe, who seeks to correct the original by inserting words and phrases in the style of Luke. On the other hand, it might with equal force be contended that these rejected varieties, both in word and style, are genuinely Lucan. For example, Blass removes, among others, the reading of

¹ "Let us be careful to define what is meant by a *practical idea*. It is the representation of a change to be effected in the world. The world changed in any way—this formula includes all practical ideas in the widest sense" (S. Bryant, *Studies in Character*, p. 63).

D in i. 14. *σὺν ταῖς γυναιξὶν καὶ τέκνοις*; and yet in xxi. 5 Luke has *σὺν γυναιξὶν καὶ τέκνοις*. Similarly in ii. 1 he deletes altogether the D addition, *ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις τοῦ*, which is confessedly and specifically a Lucan expression. On what principle does he distinguish between the rejected variations and those he accepts as genuinely Lucan? No one who reads Harnack's careful examination of the relevant passages can doubt that he succeeds in further establishing the position that Codex D is the work of a redactor, who is, above all, concerned to interpret, and is less interested in grammar than in style; who, while perhaps preserving the true text in one or two passages, yet in the majority of the additions and changes he makes, consciously adapts his style to the original.

Mr. E. F. Scott's work on the Fourth Gospel has already found a cordial reception "*jenseits des Canals*," to use, by way of retort, an expression of the German theologians for British theology. H. Holtzmann of Baden practically concurs in all its positions, and describes it as "the completest exposition of the Johannine theology which the new century has produced." It is with the greatest satisfaction that one notes the important and thoroughly deserved place that this book has come to take. It marks an English epoch in the history of the criticism of the Gospel. At the same time its fascination must not blind us to the fact that, if Mr. Scott is right in his estimate of the Fourth Gospel, serious consequences arise for the question of its historical, and therefore, we submit, of its spiritual value also. We must largely acquiesce in the general position, that in this Gospel it is not the concern of the Evangelist always to record the precise word "that once ruffled the air of Palestine," and that the narrative of events is often cast in a didactic or even an apologetic mould. Scope must also be allowed

for a certain amount of symbolism, and for the influence of a Stoic environment on the mind of the Apostle. Such a position, however, can easily be driven to an extreme, unjustified by the facts, and it is therefore absolutely necessary that a more complete study than has yet been attempted of the *Consciousness* of the Fourth Evangelist, as expressed in his own work, should be undertaken. There is a growing tendency to separate between the Author and the Beloved Disciple, which plunges us into a sea of difficulties both ethical and exegetical. The plain fact is that behind the Gospel there lies a human personality. It is unfair to the consciousness of the Evangelist himself to dismiss the question of authorship in a sentence, as Mr. Scott does, and then to proceed to expound the Gospel. Professor Burkitt, in his latest work, makes important suggestions of the line that must be followed in estimating the question of historicity. (*Gospel History and its Transmission*, pp. 238 ff.). The Evangelist is clearly interested in historical fact, and is not "merely allegorizing out of his inner consciousness."

It is of more than ordinary significance, in view of the "modern" attitude towards the Person of Jesus, to find H. Holtzmann of Baden writing thus of the German translation of Dr. Stalker's *Trial and Death of Jesus*: "Throughout the book we are in the closest contact with a deeply religious mind. It is written in the style of the noblest "Pektoraltheologie," and the language is extremely choice, and eminently worthy of the subject. We have to do with a devotional book, which, if it reaches the proper hands, and is read with true perception, will fulfil its object."

What is the true line for Christian Apologetic to-day?

In a lecture on "Certain alleged Defects in the Christian Morality," published in the *Hibbert Journal* for October, Professor James Seth says that "its function to-day is to show that Christianity is not the exceptional, the unaccountable, unrelated except by opposition to other modes of life and thought, but the supremely reasonable, the truly normal, including and interpreting, and thereby transcending, all the previous experience and insight of the race." This is quite compatible with the position, also needing emphasis to-day, that the true Apologetic will also seek to vindicate the absolute nature of the Christian faith, and of the character it produces. As bearing on this latter question, a monograph entitled *Das Wesen des Christenthums* by Professor Wobbermin of Munich is of peculiar value. In it, he asks and answers the questions, "Has Christianity hitherto developed the highest type of religious life? Is a higher conceivable?" His line of argument is full of the deepest interest. He urges that in non-Christian religions the so-called founders have often been elevated, so as to become the objects of faith and worship; but, in so far as that has taken place, the corresponding spiritual life has been depressed to a lower level than it originally occupied. Every attempt either to conceive or to evolve a higher form of religious consciousness and life than the Christian, leads to the destruction both of the religious consciousness and of that communion with God which is of the essence of religion. Such a statement involves, of course, a very definite *Weltanschauung*, which the author expresses by saying that the goal of existence is "to produce spiritual and moral personalities and to bring them into fellowship with God." Evidently the book contains a notable contribution to its subject, and touches on questions outside the range of Harnack's more famous work.

The question of the Sinlessness of Jesus is more and more gravely discussed. Johannes Ninck, in his work published last year, *Jesus als Charakter*, which evidently proceeds from the same school as Bousset and "Hilligenlei," takes the utterance of Mark x. 18 in what Wernle would call the "tenderer," i.e. the most literal sense. He boldly casts aside the dogma of the Sinlessness of our Lord. He makes a startlingly ingenious use of the idea of development in the mind of Christ. "Probably," he says, "the bare fact of His growth in knowledge, and His sense that He grew in power and in holy purpose, brought into prominence in His mind rather His previous lack of attainment than His present experience, and momentarily rather depressed than exalted Him." Wernle, in his review of the book in No. 21 of the *Th. Litteraturzeitung*, describes Ninck's treatment of the subject as "the finest he has read." It "testifies to a sense of deeper reverence for Jesus than is to be found in the writing of those who defend the dogma." Nothing can be more irreverent than misunderstanding in such a connexion, and we are by no means favourably disposed to accept his treatment of such a subject from one who writes words like these, which Wernle himself repudiates, "We may regret that He completely held aloof from marriage, and did not shed the light of His example on this difficult domain"! It is quite true that it is beyond our power to demonstrate that Jesus never committed a sinful act. That would be an impossible demand unless we possessed a detailed knowledge of all His words and acts. Yet, this is infinitely more than a problem for mere empirical science. Such criticism as Ninck's, however, is itself based—and this applies to the whole school—on a scientific method which is radically false. All the facts are not taken into account. We can only welcome straightforward investigation of the human disposition, development and environ-

ment of Jesus, and to this extent we are deeply indebted to the “*modern*” movement; but in the end the whole attitude and Personality of Jesus must be allowed to make its own impression on men’s *hearts* as in the days of His flesh. A fuller and nobler “Pektoraltheologie” is needed here. Did Jesus never say, “Thy sins are forgiven thee,” and did those who heard Him not interpret it clearly as a prerogative claimed for Himself? “Who is this that forgiveth sins also?” What kind of consciousness is it that contains not a trace of penitential feeling? “Had He Himself not experienced,” says Ninck, “the Divine Love as grace that comes to meet men with a definite purpose, His gospel would have been in the air, and have sprung from no depth of heart.” Is it then, only the sinful heart that can understand the love of God? Is the Divine Love called forth only by the sin and misery of His creatures? Is there no way of understanding and alleviating human sin save by committing it? Did He not say, out of the fulness of His own sinless experience, “Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye cannot see the kingdom of God”? ?

Whence did the Hebrews derive the notion of the Seventh Day, and of the division of time into weeks? Professor Johannes Hehn, in a valuable work entitled, *Siebenzahl und Sabbat bei den Babyloniern und im Alten Testament* has cast some new light on this subject. Assyriologists have been much accustomed to regard the number seven as suggested by the seven planets. It follows from the results of Hehn’s work that that view is no longer tenable. The conception of the planets as a group of seven is represented as a late idea and originated, in his view, in the time of Assurbanipal. Moreover, in the Assyrian religion, the sun, and not the planets, is looked upon as the central life-giving

principle in Nature. There are only a few instances in which the planets are spoken of as a unity of seven, and the use of the number as denoting perfection is completely independent of this idea. The cult of the *seven* planet gods originated, in Hehn's view, in Alexandria. These were indeed worshipped already from ancient times in Babylonia, alongside the other star-gods, as patrons of the day, but there is no trace in these earliest times of the use of the number seven in this connection. Hehn adopts the view that seven, as applied to the division of time, is derived from the four quarters of the moon, the 7th, 14th, 21st, and 28th of the month.

Much interest attaches to his exposition of the origin of the Hebrew Sabbath. He affirms that the seventh day in Babylonia was not a day of rest, but a day of atonement made to the wrath of the gods. Any trace of the term *šabbattu* as applied to the seventh day is, according to this writer, not discoverable, but he admits that the day had a character corresponding to the meaning of *šabbattu*. What is that meaning? It means in general "day of rest," but, as is well known, two different interpretations are put upon it. One is that *šabbattu* means "day of rest for the heart"; the other, "the day when the gods rest from their anger." The latter is the meaning adopted here. According to Hehn, the only point of connexion between the Hebrew and the Babylonian conceptions of the day of rest, between שַׁבָּת and *šabbattu*, is that they are both determined by the phases of the moon. "Amongst the Babylonians, seven is the perfect number, and the seventh day is the close of a period. It was therefore used for the purpose of making atonement to the gods for the sins committed during the week, and was also an appeal for grace in the days to follow. In similar fashion, in Israel, the seventh

day is the close of the period which is appointed in the heavens, but it is regarded as an indication that men should cease their business. In this sense, the Sabbath became a day of rest. The Israelitish Sabbath is, so far as we can trace it in the Old Testament, even in those passages that are undoubtedly the oldest, throughout looked upon as a universal day of rest, with a joyous and festal character. The contrast with the Babylonian idea is therefore quite plain, just as the governing notion of seven, and the similarity in the names, point to a common source, out of which both have arisen." The Babylonian day is thus, it would seem, not a *dies nefastus*, but a day of expiation. There are indeed traces, admitted by Hehn, of Sabbath enactments in the Old Testament, which recall the piacular character of the Babylonian institution (e.g. 1 Chron. xxiii. 31), but on the whole the work may be regarded as a valuable contribution towards completely establishing the independence of the idea contained in the Hebrew Sabbath.

R. H. STRACHAN.

THE CUP OF THE LORD AND THE CUP OF DEMONS.

THE one subject with which St. Paul deals in 1 Corinthians viii-x. is indicated in his first words, *περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων*, or, as it is put more precisely in verse 4, *περὶ τῆς βρώσεως τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων*. Sacrifices were still offered to the pagan deities in Corinth, and the flesh of these was either consumed in the temple itself, in a sacred meal which followed the sacrifice (viii. 10), or exposed for sale in the market (x. 25 ff.). The question at issue is whether such flesh may lawfully be eaten by Christians. Plainly there was a division of opinion at Corinth, or the matter would not have been referred to the apostle ; but plainly also those who drew up the letter to him, and who presumably represented the majority in the Church, believed themselves to be in possession of the principle by which the question was to be determined. It is the principle stated in viii. 4 : " No idol is anything in the world, and there is no God but one." It is the apostle's own principle, but though he states it with sympathetic emphasis, he seems to fence with it from the first. He mocks a little at the idea of a man determining his conduct by " principles." Conduct is something which in the nature of the case affects others, and the man who does not see this, or who does not let it decide his action, is an unenlightened man, be his principles ever so fine. He knows nothing yet as he ought to know. He has the primary rule of Christianity to learn, that conduct must be guided not by abstract but by social ideas, not by knowledge, but by love.

This is the line which St. Paul pursues in chap. viii. ; the question of eating what has been sacrificed to an idol is not to be decided even by the most enlightened and liberal Christian without carefully weighing the consequences of the decision to weaker men. The first duty of the Christian is to "build up" the body of Christ ; a fine upbuilding it would be—*ruinosa aedificatio*—if a backward believer were "built up" into following an enlightened example which wounded his conscience and frustrated in him the work of Christ.

In chap. ix. there seems to be, but is not, a digression. It is a Christian principle that no idol is anything in the world, though not a principle to be acted on as if the act could tram-mel up the consequence ; it is a Christian principle also (ix. 14) that those who preach the gospel should live by the gospel, and yet it is one, as the Corinthians are well aware, which St. Paul in his own case has forborne to assert. Possibly the fact that his apostleship was being attacked in Corinth made him not unwilling to take himself as an illustration of what he has been enjoining in chap. viii. ; the point to remember is that his own line of action does illustrate his teaching in that chapter. His apostleship was undoubted, ought to be indubitable to the Corinthians at all events (ix. 2 f.), and it carried with it the right to "eat and drink," that is, to claim maintenance from the Church. This was the principle ; but though others acted on it without misgiving (ver. 5), St. Paul found reasons in love for renouncing his right, and supported himself in Corinth as in Thessalonica by working with his own hands. It is the thought of others—how they can be won, helped, built up—and not any abstract rule of right or liberty which prescribes his line of action. "I have not stood on my rights, or asserted my principles," he seems to say : "on the contrary, I have gone to the extreme of accommodation ; I have become all things to all men that I may by all means save some." This is the line of reflexion

in chap. ix. as in chap. viii., but at the very end it takes a turn. It seems to strike the apostle suddenly that the course of renunciation, as opposed to that of "using to the full" his right in the gospel (ix. 18), is not only that which is suggested by consideration for others' interests, but that which is demanded by his own. With all its liberal and emancipating principles the Christian life is one of exacting severity; even the apostle has to recognize this and act upon it, lest after having preached to others he himself should be rejected (ix. 23-27).

It is on this line that he pursues his discussion of eating *εἰδωλόθυτα* in chap. x. Think what it means to others? Yes, and think what it means to yourselves. It is evident, from the opening paragraph of chap. x. (vers. 1-11), that the apostle has here to controvert another habit of mind which prevailed among some, at least, of the Corinthians, and made them insensible to the moral dangers of the "liberal" attitude to *εἰδωλόθυτα*. They had sacred meals of their own—they had the great sacramental feast of the Christian faith, the *κυριακὸν δεῖπνον* of xi. 20—and to these they ascribed a divine power to keep them safe. This passage (x. 2-4), in which St. Paul refers at the same time to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, is perhaps the only one in the New Testament which justifies us in treating both under the common denomination of sacraments. They were ordinances to which, in the belief of the Corinthians, some kind of sanctity attached, and in virtue of this those who had the benefit of them were supposed to be proof against moral contagion. The apostle does not dispute their sanctity, nor does he raise at this point any question as to the benefits they bestow, or the mode in which, or the conditions (if any), under which, they become effective; he confines himself to arguing that whatever be the virtue of the sacraments, it is not that which the Corinthians ascribe to them. They are not to be degraded to the

level of inoculations against the *virus* of idolatry. Look, he says, at the Old Testament, and at the things which are written there, "for our education, who are the heirs of all the ages." The Israelites, too, had their sacraments, and without exception they had the benefit of them. They were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; they passed through the flood on foot, out of bondage into final liberty, with all their faith and hope centring on Moses as ours in our baptism on Christ. They had a sacred repast also which never failed them; they all ate the same "spiritual" food, they all drank the same "spiritual" drink—the same not only as each other, but as we; for they drank of a "spiritual" rock which followed them, and the rock was the Christ. St. Paul no doubt remembers the Jewish legend that the rock which Moses smote in the wilderness became a rolling stone which accompanied the people in their wanderings, but we do not need to believe that he adopts it. Indeed, the use of the adjective (*πνευματική*, ver. 4) and the absence of the article (the Authorized Version, which has "*that* spiritual rock" instead of "a" spiritual rock, is peculiarly misleading) amount to a sound proof that he did not. What he asserts is that behind those manifestations of God's goodness to Israel in the wilderness lay the very same divine power which lies behind the Christian sacraments—that which is revealed to us in Christ. There is one God and Saviour through all the ages, one grace, one relation of men to it, one kind of help it gives, one kind of responsibility it involves. If it was not a spell in the desert of the Exodus, it is not a spell in the temples and streets of Corinth. If it did not shield from God's judgment those who in ancient days played with idolatry and its accompaniments at Baalpeor, neither will it shield those who under the gospel allow themselves to forget that God is a holy and jealous God. It is the faith of the Corinthians in their sacraments,

their faith in them as divine charms neutralizing whatever is unwholesome in the moral environment, that frightens the apostle. It is their very security which is their peril. To men in this mood he cries, "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall." The circumstances of the Corinthian Christians are, no doubt, such as to involve trial; but the trial is one proportioned to human strength, and what is wanted to make them victorious in it is not this superstitious reliance on the sacraments, but a quick and wakeful faith in the living God. The moral of Israel's history is plain. It does not say to us, "Keep your minds easy. Armed in enlightened Christian principle, and inoculated with sacramental grace, you can take any liberty you please about *εἰδωλόθυτα* and about idols generally"; it says, "Flee from idolatry. Do not come into contact with it at all."

In the passage which follows (chap. x. 15-24) it is the argument drawn from the sacraments with which St. Paul is concerned. The Corinthians assumed that participation in the sacraments made it safe for them to act on liberal principles where paganism was involved; the apostle argues that participation in the sacraments is inconsistent with any positive relation to paganism whatever. "Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons; ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons."

It cannot be questioned that there are many Christians who are embarrassed by the sacraments. They cannot tell what to make in their minds of these apparently material things surviving in a purely spiritual religion. They are disconcerted by them, and feel them dead matter in their spiritual world, an irreducible irrational quantity in their reasonable worship. The Society of Friends dispenses with them, and has the sympathy in so doing of many in churches in which they are still celebrated. In view of their degeneration into what he calls fetish worship, the late Dr. A. B.

Bruce, in his commentary on Matthew, raises the question whether their discontinuance, at least for a time, would not be a benefit to the religion of the spirit and more in harmony with the mind of Christ than their obligatory observance. In churches, on the other hand, which claim the "catholic" character, the sacraments are, as it were, underlined. Their material or sensible side is not regarded as inconsistent with a place in a spiritual religion, but rather as giving them a unique place; they are not excluded from a spiritual Christianity, they stand there in high relief. The very heart of the matter is in them; they enshrine the whole grace and truth of the gospel. One may feel that this is true, without thinking about it; it is when thinking begins, and a doctrine of the sacraments has to be defined—of the grace which is associated with them, and of the conditions on which it is bestowed—that difficulties arise. Most Protestants are convinced that the "catholic" doctrine of the sacraments is too closely akin to the Corinthian superstitions which St. Paul here condemns. There is something in it which they cannot distinguish from magic. The Christian sacrament is reduced to a pagan mystery, in which spiritual ends are attained by means which are not spiritual; and this is a result to which no intelligent Christian can subscribe.

Within recent years the application of which is called the "religio-historical" method to the study of the New Testament has directed attention anew to this subject. The general idea of this method is that Christianity, even as it appears in the New Testament, is an example of religious syncretism. The river of the water of life no sooner began to flow through history than tributary streams flowed into it from all sides and from the most various sources. Essentially, it is assumed, Christianity should be a religion without cultus, a worship in spirit and in truth; but though this is a com-

paratively easy idea for men like us, who reduce religion to theology and morals, it was impossibly hard for ancient minds to whom cultus and religion were one. Christianity, however, from the first had two customs, that of baptizing its adherents when they professed their faith, and that of a common meal, on which the craving for a cultus at once took hold. It attached itself to these ordinances and transformed them; it regarded them, in fact, as analogous ordinances in the pagan mysteries were regarded, as charged with magical supernatural powers; baptism *ipso facto* ensured cleansing; it was a kind of spiritual disinfecting, by which sin was neutralized; participation in the Lord's Supper in the same way guaranteed immortality. We see from the tenth chapter of 1 Corinthians, it is argued, how rapidly this process was accomplished; a "catholic" doctrine of the sacraments is found in the New Testament, within the first generation, in the lifetime of Paul himself; the Corinthians evidently thought of baptism and the Lord's Supper, in spite of their profanation of the latter, just as a modern Catholic does.

Much of this is probably true. Religions with "mysteries" were the only potent religions in the first century, and it was only natural that people who passed from such religions to Christianity should bring their mental habitudes along with them, and read the ordinances of the new religion in the light of ideas borrowed from the old. It is not possible to exaggerate the crudity of these ideas, nor to trace them to an origin too low. There were pagan rites in which the worshipper was believed literally to eat his god, and so to become participant in divine life. The fish, Professor Cumont tells us,¹ was sacred to Atargatis, and in ordinary circumstances was *tabu*. "But in certain mystical repasts the priests and the initiated ate this forbidden food, and believed that in so doing they took into themselves the

¹ *Les Religions Orientales dans le Paganisme Romain*, p. 142.

flesh of the divinity herself." There was no philosophy or theology of this, no doctrine of transubstantiation or other doctrine to explain it. In point of fact it is a survival of ideas belonging to the most primitive stage of human intelligence. "It is a belief," as the same great scholar reminds us, "widely diffused among savage peoples, that in drinking or bathing in the blood, or in devouring some inward part of an enemy who has fallen in battle or of an animal which has been killed in the chase, one transfers to himself the qualities of the dead man or beast."¹ It is to roots like these that the superstition of the Corinthians goes back; and while it is not incredible that superstition should have gathered round the sacraments in a community to which religion and mystery-rites were synonymous, it is more than astonishing to find scholars arguing that superstitions with roots like these were the sacramental doctrine of St. Paul himself. One illustration may be given for many. "What we know most accurately," says Dieterich,² "is the sacramental meal of the ancient Christian Church. Whatever the Lord's Supper may have signified originally, and in whatever sense it may have been instituted, there can be no doubt as to how it was apprehended by Paul. When, in the passage which speaks of the holy supper, he forbids to believers all participation in an idol supper, in order that they may not come into the fellowship of demons (οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι, 1 Cor. x. 20), we recognize at once that a magical communion through sacrifice is what he believes in." Dieterich then quotes 1 Corinthians x. 16 f. and goes on: "Such sentences can no longer be misunderstood by us. Christ is eaten and drunk by believers and through that eating and drinking (*dadurch*) is in them. This, too, is the only thing which makes in-

¹ Ibid. p. 83.

² *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, p. 106.

telligible that notable saying, ὥστε ὃς ἂν ἐσθίῃ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον ἢ πίνῃ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ Κυρίου ἀναξίως ἔνοχος ἔσται τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Κυρίου (1 Cor. xi. 27). He has been guilty of an impiety upon the real body and blood of the Lord, because in any case he has in point of fact (auf jeden Fall *faktisch*) eaten body and blood. No more words are needed."

This is more emphatic than convincing, and most readers will remain of opinion that more words are needed. Dieterich may do justice to the Corinthians, but it is another question whether he does justice to St. Paul. No doubt in arguing with the Corinthians the apostle argues *ex concessis*; he has common ground on which to meet them. But he is controverting their opinion as to what the sacraments can do for them, and it is probable rather than otherwise that this implies a difference of opinion not only about what they effect but about how they effect it. To speak about a "magical" communion through sacrifice is simply to beg the question, and to do so in the sense which is most at variance with St. Paul's purpose here, and with what we know of his mind otherwise. What the apostle says in chap. x. 16 is that the cup of blessing which we bless is a joint participation in the blood of Christ, and the bread which we break a joint participation in His body. *Κοινωνία* includes a reference to the relation of Christians to one another as well as to their relation to Christ. As Canon Evans puts it, it is "the fellowship of persons with persons in one and the same object"; and we must remember that consideration for others and for the unity of the Church are motives to which St. Paul recurs again and again in chaps. viii.-xi. But the main point here is undoubtedly participation in the body and blood of Christ. In spite of verse 17 I cannot think of any reference to the mystical body, the Church; the body and the blood must be determined by each other, and by the

words of institution. But what is meant by participation in them ? And how is it mediated ?

In spite of the embarrassments to which reference has been made, surely no Christian will question that there is a real presence of the Lord in the celebration of the supper. It is the table of *the Lord* at which he sits, it is the cup of *the Lord* from which he drinks. He may be quite incapable of believing in a real presence of the Lord in the material elements. What is sometimes called "the sacramental union" of the symbol and the thing signified may be to his mind nothing but a superstition as unintelligent and degrading as the savage ideas which are its lineal ancestry ; but if he is a Christian at all, he must hold (and experience) that Christ is present in the supper in the sense of the elements and of the use to which we put them. He must believe (and experience) that the Lord is with us to all the intents and purposes signified by the elements and the actions. He is with us, that is to say, in the virtue of His broken body and His shed blood ; He is with us as the Lord who bore our sins in His own body on the tree, and made one sacrifice for them for ever ; He is with us that the unsearchable power of His atoning love may enter into us, condemning, subduing, annihilating, regenerating ; He is with us to impart Himself to us as the meat and drink of our souls. We *have* this real presence, a presence which the supper enables us to realize in all its wonderful grace. We have this divine, this truly supernatural thing, at the heart of our Christian life ; it does not rest on the wisdom of man, but on the presence and power of the Redeemer, with whom we have communion at His table. But there is no magic in this, and nothing superstitious. It raises no questions about the bread and the wine, except the one question what they signify. It is literally senseless to ask what they become, or what is the relation to them after "conse-

cration"—an idea quite unknown to the New Testament—of the body and blood of Christ. We may quite fairly call them symbols of Christ's body and blood, remembering, however, as we do so that the use of a symbol is not, as the analytic modern mind is apt to think, to come between us and the reality, but rather to enable us more sensibly to apprehend the reality. If we were to say that they were "merely" symbols, probably something in an earnest Christian spirit would betray resentment or dissatisfaction. But that something would not be intellectual. It would not be a metaphysical instinct which was being overlooked and which craved for a more precise and positive definition of the connexion between the bread and wine and the Lord's body and blood; it would be the element of spiritual emotion in which the supper is celebrated and communion with Christ realized; this emotional element in Christian experience would protest against the "merely" as emphasizing a distinction which in the vivid experience of celebrating the supper does not come into consciousness at all. But, on the other hand, it must be insisted that it is only in that vivid experience that the distinction of symbol and thing signified disappears. It does not disappear on the plane of logic or of physical or metaphysical science; it disappears only in the element of spiritual emotion which belongs to the celebration of the supper. The magical ideas surviving from prehistoric times and filtering into the catholic doctrine of the sacraments through the revival of the mystery-cults in the early centuries, and the medieval metaphysics of transubstantiation are equally without relation to the fact to be explained. They are answers to questions, and the final objection to them is, not that the answers are wrong, but that the questions have no meaning. The one thing that is entirely deplorable in the celebration of the supper—the one thing that is entirely irrational and unprofitable in theologiz-

ing about it—is to have any questions whatever, or any answers to questions, about the bread and the wine. As we use them in the supper we enter into a true union and communion with the Lord whose death we proclaim ; our hearts are satisfied with nothing short of calling them His body and blood—His very self in all the reality of His incarnation and passion ; but the emotion and experience which are not satisfied with a more restrained expression are not interpreted or vindicated, they are degraded and misconstrued, alike in Corinthian superstition and in what is usually put forward as sacramental or Catholic theology.

That this is the true direction in which to follow the apostle's thought is shown by the analogies to which he appeals, often as these are cited in another sense. " Look, he says, " at Israel after the flesh : have not they who eat the sacrifices communion with the altar ? " It is unreasonable to speak of the eating of the sacrifices as if it could be insulated, or as if in such insulation it magically united the worshipper to Jehovah. The eating of the sacrifice is the culmination of the Israelite's worship. He does not eat his God ; he rather shares in the food of which his God in ancient times was believed to partake (Lev. xxi. 6) ; he sits at His table, under His benediction ; he realizes the truth that he has a place in the great society in which God and man have a common life and common ends ; but there is no meaning in asking what the relation is between the flesh which he eats and his assurance of partaking in the life of God. Isolate the flesh thus, and there is no relation at all. But his experience is strictly similar to that which we have described as the Christian experience in the celebration of the supper. There is nothing magical, nothing superstitious ; but there is a revived sense of union with God under conditions which, when viewed as a whole, are thoroughly intelligible.

It is the same with the sacrificial worship of paganism. St. Paul has admitted already that no idol is anything in the world ; and it might plausibly be argued that in this case there could be no possibility of coming into real communion with anything ; but he declines the inference. Although the idol is nothing, the vast system of paganism has spiritual powers behind it ; it is sustained by beings hostile to Christ ; “The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God ; and I would not that ye should have communion with demons.” The apostle believed that the demons existed, undoubtedly, and that those who took part in pagan worship entered into communion with them ; but it is grotesque as well as gratuitous to maintain that the material act of eating the sacrificial flesh essentially and magically mediated this communion. Such eating, as in the case of Israel after the flesh, was the culmination of worship, and the apostle thought of it as he knew it, not as a magical device, but in its whole conditions and circumstances. He could see in his mind’s eye a company of worshippers go up to the temple of Aphrodite or Apollo. He could see them sprinkled with lustral water, and standing by in sacred silence while the victim was slain ; he could see them join in the songs and dances which filled up the time between the sacrifice itself and the preparation of the sacramental meal, and reflected the religious mood of the festival, whatever it might be ; he could see them at last give themselves up to the joy of the meal which crowned the festal day in honour of the god.¹ We know sufficiently what this meal was. It is revealed in Aristotle’s derivation of μεθύειν, to be drunk, from μετὰ τὸ θύειν, after the sacrifice. It was a scene of revelling and excess. This, and not some abstract conception about supernatural beings to whom men are magically united by participating in a mystical rite, is what St. Paul

¹ See Heinrici, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, ad loc.

has before his mind. He no more thinks the demons are eaten in the sacrificial flesh which had touched a pagan altar than he thinks the God of Israel is eaten in the flesh which has touched His altar. He has the enlightened and liberal Christians of Corinth in his eye, and he dreads that their very enlightenment and liberality may lead them into danger in their dealings with paganism. No matter how sure a man's hold may be of the Christian principle that an idol is nothing in the world, and therefore can do no harm to any enlightened person ; no matter how thoroughly he may have made himself, as he thinks, infection-proof, by eating and drinking at the Lord's table ; if he takes part in such a transaction as has been described, then its atmosphere, its circumstances, its spirit will prevail against him ; in spite of his enlightenment and of his superstition he will be sucked into the great communion of heathen life again. The life that is in him in that environment will not be that of Christ ; it will be that of those powers hostile to Christ by which the degrading system of paganism is sustained. Nothing was commoner in paganism than for a man to be initiated in succession into many mysteries, but the Christian lived under another rule. The jealousy of God is the fundamental law of the true religion ; and for any one who understands what they mean it is impossible to drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons. No enlightenment can make it anything but a wanton provocation of God.

The lesson of this passage does not depend on our acceptance or rejection of the apostle's explanation of heathenism. It is easy to say that we do not believe in demons—as easy as to say that an idol is nothing in the world. It is easy to say that there are no such persons as Bacchus and Aphrodite. The real question, as one of our most brilliant Greek scholars puts it, is, Are there no such things ? Are there no powers in the world in which we live radically and finally

hostile to Christ? Or is it as true now as when St. Paul wrote, that our conflict is not with flesh and blood—not with other human creatures like ourselves, whom we could fight, so to speak, with our hands—but with invisible influences which are far more subtle, potent and omnipresent than that of a human will—with a whole world or system of spiritual forces which is essentially antichristian? Whatever the speculative answer may be, the experimental one agrees with the apostle's. The cup of demons is still offered to us as well as the cup of the Lord, and it is still drunk as of old under the sign of liberty. Even a Christian man will sometimes argue to himself that everything in human life as it has actually shaped itself in God's providence must have a legitimacy of its own. We ought to cultivate breadth, appreciation, geniality, and to shun a censorious and puritanic temper. The world that is good enough for God should be good enough for us, and we should not be too good to take it as it is. It is argued even that the severity of this chapter is an idiosyncrasy of St. Paul, and that the more appreciative and tolerant view can appeal against the disciple to his Lord. But surely even in the New Testament Jesus is the great preacher of separation, of renunciation, of the Cross. Above all others His is the voice which proclaims Either . . . or. The one thing which alarms him and calls forth from his love the most passionate warnings is the disposition in men to believe that "all things are lawful"—that nature is entitled to take the world as it stands, and to assert itself without reserve through the impulses that God has implanted in it. If a man is so confident in this principle that he will never sacrifice hand or foot or eye—never do violence to his nature, or curtail or maim it on any side; if he is so confident in it that he will go wherever his two feet can carry him, and handle whatever his two hands itch to touch, and gloat on all that his two eyes crave to see, our Lord tells us what the end will be. It

is not that the enlightened and liberal man gets an ampler and richer character, it is that he forfeits character altogether. It is not an abundant entrance into life which is the issue, but the sinking of an exhausted nature into hell. For creatures such as we are, in a world such as this, these, according to Jesus, are the alternatives. And they are alternatives. This is the philosophy of Puritanism, when enlightenment has said its last word : Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons ; ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord and the table of demons. As surely as we would have Christ and the Atonement, the judgment and the mercy of God, the spirit of holiness and the hope of heaven remain real to us, so surely must we renounce the things which cast upon them all the shadow of unreality and neutralize in our life their redeeming power. There are such things. We have all known them. We have all loved them. We have all feared them. It is our Lord who says to us, Cut them off, for your life.

JAMES DENNEY.

FOLKLORE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE services of Dr. Frazer to Anthropology and Comparative Religion are so very remarkable that his contribution to the volume dedicated to Dr. Tylor¹ is likely to attract very general attention among Biblical students. The subject is not indeed a new one : owing to the Bible being more read than any other book, those who have studied the ways of primitive peoples have in general been ready to perceive parallels between its records and the practices with which they have become acquainted in the course of their investigations ; and, indeed, Dr. Orr complained in

¹ *Anthropological Essays* dedicated to E. B. Tylor, Oxford, 1907, pp. 100-176, "Folklore in the Old Testament," by J. G. Frazer.

a recent work that too much had been done in this field. The amount of savage practice found in the records of the Israelites was greater than *one* people could be expected to exhibit.

Certainly the introduction of folklore in comments on the Old Testament is, at times, more ingenious than convincing. Such is Winckler's remarkably interesting suggestion that the calamity which attended the rebuilding of Jericho (1 Kings xvi. 34) consisted in the builder sacrificing his eldest son at the commencement, and his youngest son at the termination of the operations. That this horrible practice was at one time in vogue is probably attested by excavations ; but if it was in vogue, it is not easy to see how in this particular case it could have come to be regarded not as the voluntary act of the builder, but as a misfortune incurred by him through violating the command not to rebuild Jericho ; whereas the older theory that the builder's loss of his sons was a misfortune that attracted attention and even led to the discovery of a prophecy appears far more natural.

The subject of human sacrifice in the Old Testament has been discussed by a German anthropologist, F. Maurer, in the geographical and anthropological magazine, *Globus*, for 1897 (vol. xci. 111), and the same writer has dealt with *Taboos* in that magazine for 1906 (vol. xc. 137). As this anthropologist finds the principle of human sacrifice in the practice of circumcision, in the exposure of the infant Moses, and in David's fasting for Bathsheba's child, it would seem that Dr. Orr's criticism has some justification. There are so many allusions to the matter in the Old Testament which are clear and unquestionable, that there is no occasion to look for it where it is not to be found. The most luminous passage dealing with the subject is, of course, Genesis xxii. ; and for the interpretation of that chapter the materials

collected by Professor Murray in his recent *Rise of the Greek Epic* are of especial value.

One of the most striking of Dr. Frazer's comments is on a text in which traces of ancient folklore might reasonably be looked for—the speech of a woman—Abigail to David, in 1 Samuel xxv. 29. That the “bundle of life” to which she refers has reminded many of those fairy tales in which the souls of living people are lodged apart from their bodies, seems likely; but nothing so closely parallel to Abigail's expression has hitherto been adduced as the “bundles of *churinga*, flattened and elongated stones and sticks, which the Arunta and other tribes of Central Australia keep with the greatest care and secrecy in caves and crevices of rocks.” These objects represent the souls of the members of the tribe. They correspond wonderfully with those of which Abigail is thinking, because they are capable of being tied up tight (as was to be the case with David's), or flung away (which was to happen to those of his enemies). As in the latter case it is specified that the process is accomplished by means of a sling, the objects contained in the “bundle” or bag of life would appear to have been stones. The expression occurs nowhere else (for the re-translator of Eccclus. vi. 16, of course, gets it from the passage in 1 Samuel, and very erroneously substitutes it for a “drug of life”), and is probably characteristic of “women's talk,” which, in some Eastern languages, shows very marked peculiarities, and is likely to retain traces of discarded superstitions, or at least references to stories told to children, which ordinarily are traceable to old mythologies. In some such story this bag of life may have figured.

Dr. Frazer's first comment is on the mark of Cain, and consists of a highly interesting and valuable collection of cases in which marks are employed in connexion with homicides, for a variety of purposes and intents. This

“mark,” however, belongs to the Authorized Version ; the Revised interprets more cautiously, “ And the Lord appointed a sign for Cain, lest any finding him should smite him ” ; to be quite exact, the second clause should run, “ that he should not be smitten by any one who found him.” The text furnishes no means of settling whether a sign was wrought for Cain’s benefit—some miracle convincing him that he might with safety go into exile : or whether he was furnished with a mark indicating to those who met him that he was sacrosanct. The former interpretation is supported by many obvious parallels from early times to that of Zacharias in the Gospel of St. Luke ; a divine promise is made, but the hearer requires a miracle to be wrought to convince him that the promise will be kept. Cain’s punishment is exile, for the land that has been polluted by “ kindred blood ” will bear no crop till the murderer has been ejected ; but in a strange country a man has no rights, and is likely to be slain by the first person who meets him. How then can Cain have the courage to accept his doom and exile himself ? A miracle is wrought and he is convinced. If this be the author’s thought, then Dr. Frazer’s illustrations, in spite of their great interest and value, will be off the point ; except, indeed, those in which the belief that fratricide caused famine is paralleled from Greek mythology.

Supposing that a mark on Cain’s person be meant, perhaps the best illustration would be found in that necklace or garland of the plant ‘*idâh*, which, according to the historian of Meccah, was worn by the Kuraish when they left the sacred territory, so as to secure immunity for their persons in strange lands : “ Those who saw this badge said ‘ These are Allah’s people,’ and would not attack them.” The badge would indicate that such an act would incur the wrath of Allah, and the text of Genesis suggests something

of the kind—if the mark was really on Cain. Dr. Frazer's examples refer mainly to marks worn by homicides, and two sets out of three to marks borne with the idea of preventing the *ghost* of the murdered man taking vengeance. If it was Abel's ghost which Cain feared, the difficulty that has been found in the absence of other inhabitants of the world vanishes.

In any case Dr. Frazer's discussion is a great advance on that of Stade, which is, perhaps, the most diffuse that has at present been written on the subject. Stade supposed that the purpose of the myth was to account for the nomad character of the Kenites, which Israel, in the agricultural stage, would regard as a curse. This, then, had been incurred by some crime—the murder of Abel. But the Kenites also (presumably) wore some mark, indicating that they were worshippers of Jehovah, and so sacrosanct. Of the existence of such a mark worn by the Kenites there is no evidence; and the ground whence Cain is banished is at one time represented by Stade as the land of Israel, which would bear the murderer no produce, though it would bear it to others; at another as the *sanctuary*, within which the murderer would be safe. It would seem clear that it could not be both.

Probably the interpretation of the narrative should start from the name *Nod*, which must have been the name of a real country, just as the names by which Paradise is located are real geographical names. And, indeed, *Nadd* is an Arabic place-name, said to mean originally either "hill" or "crag"; the geographers tell us of a place of this name in Yemen, where also they locate one called *Ḥanak*, which would agree with that built by Cain and called after his firstborn, whose name, too (*Ḥinâk*) is employed in Arabian nomenclature. All that is intended by these comparisons is to show that the names in the text are likely to have

belonged to real places. Just then as Latium was so called (in theological theory) because some one "hid" (*latuit*) there, so Nod or Nadd was so called because some one fled thither. From whom? From an avenger of blood, since he is the most natural cause for flight. How came Cain to shed blood? Here we shall scarcely be wrong in finding the clue to the answer in another etymology—*Kain*, from *kinnê*, "to be jealous," which philologically stands on a par with that actually recorded in Genesis, from *kânâ*, "to acquire."

In the case of Abel, the Arabic sense of the root whence his name is derived, "to be bereaved," might seem to furnish an admirable etymological basis for his part of the narrative. This is rendered probable by the fact that Cain, too, is an Arabic name with a meaning (smith) preserved in the Biblical compounds, though neglected in the Biblical etymology. The Arabian tribes called after persons named Cain appear to have been numerous.¹ In Abel's case Josephus and the Alexandrines suspected an etymology from the Hebrew *êbhel*, "grief." The older the form of the narrative, the more fully are the etymologies likely to have been given. Where they are omitted, the commentator is in danger of finding the gist of the narration where it did not originally belong.

Dr. Frazer's third collection deals with the "heap" or cairn of stones raised by Jacob and Laban to commemorate their covenant (Gen. xxxi. 45). Here again a name plays a great part in the story. The name Gilead is derived from two words signifying "heap-witness," and the narrative explains how the heap arose and to what it witnessed. If we are to infer from its statement that Gilead was actually

¹ A story given in a book published quite recently (the *Amâlî* of *Kâlî*, i. 143) gives us the name of a Cainite—*Masâd b. Madh'ûr*, "Peak son of Frightened." The verb *nadda*, "to flee," occurs in this story.

called *Ygar Sahadûthâ* by the Syrians, the etymology would have strong grounds in its favour ; perhaps, however, that remarkable gloss need only be regarded as the Aramaic equivalent of the words which the etymology restores. Against the philological correctness of the etymology we have the fact that the equivalent of *Gilead* appears as an Arabic quadriliteral, which does not admit of the analysis "heap-witness," because the latter portion in the sense of "witness" is a late and distinctly Hebrew formation.

Whether the etymology be correct or not, it is of interest to know what ideas the writer would be likely to associate with a "heap-witness." The passage exhibits conflation of documents, in a marked degree, with narratives based on archaic variants in the *reading* of a proper name.¹ According to verse 52 the heap is symbolic of a frontier wall, which neither party was to cross with evil intent. It is scarcely, therefore, to be compared with the familiar stone-heap of Arabian paganism, which, according to M. Chauvin, was intended to preserve land from appropriation for a year's time. What is common to both is that the part stands for the whole : a fraction of a wall is built to represent a whole wall ; a fraction of a field is rendered unfit for cultivation, to indicate that a whole area is not to be used for that purpose.

Dr. Frazer's explanation is quite different. He lays stress on the fact that, according to the Authorized Version, Jacob and Laban "did eat there upon the heap," and finds the essence of the ceremony in their eating food upon the stones. His extraordinarily interesting collection of examples all illustrate the idea of stability and solidity connected with stones, on which people swear, and whose qualities they in some way imbibe. While the common meal is an attempt to establish a bond of unity between the two

¹ Mizpeh and Massebah.

covenanters, that bond is strengthened by absorbing into their system the solidity of the stones.

The only question which occurs to the reader is whether a *heap* formed of stones that were picked up (ver. 45) and flung (ver. 51) would serve as a convenient symbol of solidity and permanence. While the illustrations correspond remarkably with the passage in Joshua xxiv. 27, where a stone that has heard what has been said is deposited to bear eternal witness thereunto, their appropriateness to an improvised stone-heap seems questionable : a stone endures, but a heap of stones collapses. On the other hand they do suit that form of the narrative in which the contracting parts set up a *maṣṣēbhāh*, or stone monument. One might gather that the association of a heap with evidence (which is contained in the etymology) was not in itself usual from the fact that the narrative contains more than one suggestion with regard to the purpose of this heap. One suggestion is that it was to serve as a table ; another that it was to be a landmark.

In illustration of the narrative of Jacob's wrestling matter is brought by Dr. Frazer from the depths of paganism—stories of water-gods who can only appear at night, and who must be caught by some wile before they can be made to *foretell the future*. These last words are italicized because, though they are not in the text of Genesis, they are put into it by Josephus in his epitome : “these things the phantom foretold to Jacob at his request ; for perceiving that the phantom was a messenger of God, he requested it to tell him what would be his fate.” Dr. Frazer suggests with evident justice that our present text has been much abridged, whence there is much in it that is hard to understand. What appears very clearly is that, as in the other cases, the etymologies form the centre of the narrative. The name Jabbok is probably identical with the Arabic

yanbû' or Yanbo, "a stream," or "spring"—a name which is still found in Arabia. From this by dialectic changes Jabbok originates, which to the author abridged in Genesis seems to mean "he strove." Who strove with whom? To this the answer is furnished by the name Israel, which seems to mean, "he overcame El in wrestling"—*yaṣra'îl*. The name Penuel is interpreted as meaning that Jacob on this occasion had seen El face to face: this seems sufficient to explain the mention of the detail of the dawn. But the refusal of the personage with whom Jacob wrestled to utter his name may also be etymological; for it would not be surprising to find that the word Penuel was also derived from *Pelônî*, a Semitic word for some one whose name is not mentioned whether known or not.

If this be so, and we have to do with a "historical geography" of Palestine, in which the etymology of the names plays a leading part, there is clearly some danger everywhere of assigning to folklore what really belongs to etymology. Just as above we should not be justified in inferring that heaps were witnesses, but that some account had to be given of a place called Heap-witness, so parallels from mythology are perhaps unsafe in a case where there is a name which apparently means "Wrestle-God" to be explained, accompanied by a river-name which sounds like "he strove."

The last comment is on "the keepers of the threshold," whose duty is identified by Dr. Frazer with that of officials at various Moslem and pagan courts, who had to see that no one stepped upon the threshold, a part of the house to which many superstitions attach. The difficulty is that in Zephaniah i. 9 punishment is threatened those who "leap over the threshold," which is apparently what these other officials compel people to do. Dr. Frazer alters the above rendering, which is that of the R.V., back to that of the A.V., "leap on the threshold," and charges the former with

error ; the R.V. appears, however, to be in accordance with the best Hebraists (e.g., Ewald and Hitzig, who both render *springt über die Schwelle*). And, indeed, the word "leap" or "jump" seems to render no other interpretation permissible ; for a leap is required in order to *clear* a threshold, but not in order to mount upon it. Hence the old commentators thought that the practice of the Philistines was purposely avoided by the pious Israelites, and that it was imitation of the practice which would bring punishment.

Certainly the Hebrew word for "threshold" (*miṭṭān*), which appears to be derived from a root meaning "to try" or "to seduce," might seem to embody some ancient folklore, and there might be mythological reasons why a "place of trial or seduction" should in some way be evaded, as was done by those Arabs who would not enter their dwellings by the door. The name, however, may be interpreted more simply. A yet earlier meaning of the root is "to question," and "place of questioning" seems a natural and highly appropriate name for the "threshold." It is there that inquiries are made both as to the inmates of the house and the visitors. If, therefore, it could be shown that the threshold superstitions of other races had their parallels among the Hebrews, it would be reasonable to suppose that with the latter they had an etymological origin.

But does the passage of Zephaniah really deal with a perfectly harmless practice ? The persons who leap "upon" or "over" the threshold are said to fill their master's house with violence and deceit—more accurately, perhaps, robbery and fraud. Hence it has been conjectured that some thief's trick is the subject of the allusion ; and an Arabic writer has provided us with a collection of such tricks out of which some sort of parallel might be produced. He professes to have entered one of the Mosques of Baghdad,

where there were people admiring the roofing, and talking of the benefactions ; and the end of their conversation led them to enumerate the tricks of the *chevaliers d'industrie*. These, which in any case might be difficult to follow, are made yet more so by the description being in rhymed prose, whence there is much that is uncertain in the explanation. In any case they include such methods as hypnotizing the victim, and what is called the confidence trick.

The trick in the list that most resembles "jumping over the threshold" is that of the man "who bursts in at the door in the guise of a guest, or enters the house in the form of a visitor."¹ His predatory intentions are apparently concealed under the disguise of familiarity, to be adopted in case he is observed. The *modus operandi* is not quite clear, any more than it is with most of the tricks enumerated : but "bursting in at the door," seems a fair analogue to "leaping over the threshold," and the two may have been done with the same intent.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

IV.

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE WITNESS—THE BURIAL.

ONE of the most touching scenes in Goethe's *Faust* is where the heart-sick sceptic, about to drain the poison-goblet, is turned from his purpose by hearing the ringing of the Easter bells, and the choral hymns, proclaiming that the Lord is risen. "I hear your message," is his first comment, "but I have not faith. Miracle is faith's favourite child."² In this we hear the voice of to-day. But the sweet sounds,

¹ Hamadhâni, *Makâmahs*, ed. Beyrut, 1889, p. 162.

² "Das Wunder ist des Glaubens liebstes Kind."

with their tidings of victory and joy for the world, melt and conquer—for the time..

Sing ye on, sweet songs that are of heaven !
Tears come, Earth has her child again.

It is this "Easter Message," fraught with such infinite consolation for mankind, which is again placed in question. The mood of the sceptic is resumed. Faith may, if it will, believe that Jesus lives with God ; that He has not in spirit succumbed to death. But the historical fact on which the Church has hitherto reposed its confidence in His victory over death—His Resurrection in the body from the grave—is negatived as incredible, and the evidence on which the belief rests is declared to be valueless as proof of so great a wonder. A little has already been said of the methods by which the breaking down of the evidence is attempted on the part of historical criticism. Much is made of the secondary character of the narratives, of their contradictions, of the mythical and legendary elements alleged to be apparent in them. The accounts are pitted against each other, are picked to pieces, and attacked in their separate details ("divide and conquer").¹ Their larger coherences, the connexion with the life of Christ as a whole, their antecedents and consequents in revelation and history—all this is left out of view or minimized. It is time to come to closer quarters with this bold challenge of the evidence, and to ask how far the denial rests on satisfactory grounds.

One or two general remarks are pertinent at the outset.

It is customary to urge as decisive against the narratives of the Gospels that not any of the writers are first-hand witnesses. This, however, as already hinted, is to take

¹ Cf., amongst recent works, *Die Auferstehung Christi*, by Arnold Meyer (1905), and the work of Prof. Lake repeatedly referred to, *The Historical Evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*. (Now Abbé Loisy's *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*.)

much too narrow a view. If the Fourth Gospel, as is here presumed, and as indications in its Resurrection narratives themselves tend to show, is a genuine work of the Apostle John, we have one witness of foremost rank who *was* an eye-witness. St. Mark, according to a tradition which there seems no reason to doubt, was the "interpreter" of St. Peter¹—another primary witness. St. Luke lays stress upon the fact that the things which he relates rested primarily on the testimony of those "which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word."² The Gospel of St. Matthew, if not directly the work of that Apostle, must have been written by one in such close intimacy with the Apostle—another first-hand witness—that his Gospel ever after passed as St. Matthew's own.³ St. Paul's appeal is to eye-witnesses.⁴

But there is more than this. It is never to be forgotten that, as the words of St. Luke above cited imply, the writers of the Synoptical Gospels, like Confucius in China, were not "originators" but "transmitters." Their business was not to create, but simply to record, as faithfully as they could, a tradition already existing and well established in the Church—a tradition derived originally from Apostles, circulating in oral and written form, and well preserved by careful catechetical teaching. It is to be remembered that the Apostles, with numerous other eye-witnesses, lived for years together at Jerusalem, continuously engaged in the work of instruction; that during this period they were in constant communication with each other, with their con-

¹ Papias, in Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* iii. 39, and generally in the ancient Church. Cf. Meyer, Weiss, Westcott, Salmon, Zahn, etc.

² Luke i. 2.

³ Cf. Zahn, *Einleitung*, ii. 259. All early writers agree in accepting the Greek Gospel as St. Matthew's, even while declaring that he wrote in Aramaic.

⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 5-8.

verts, and with the Churches which they founded ; that the witness which they bore necessarily acquired a fixed and familiar form ; and that the deposit of the common tradition which we have in the Gospels has behind it, in its main features, all the weight of this consentient testimony—is, therefore, of the highest value as evidence. If it is not the testimony of this or that single eye-witness, it may be something better.

Next, as to the “contradictions.” These, it will be seen immediately, are greatly exaggerated. But even on the points which present undeniable difficulties, certain things, in fairness, are to be borne in mind. We see how minute, faithful, and life-like are the narratives of the Lord’s Crucifixion. The events of the Resurrection morning could not be less well known. The Apostles were, above all things else, witnesses to the Resurrection.¹ Within a few weeks of the Crucifixion they were proclaiming the Resurrection of Jesus in the streets of Jerusalem, and making multitudes of converts by their preaching.² The facts must have been constantly talked about, narrated in preaching, experiences compared, particular incidents connected with this or that person or group of persons, either as original informants, or as prominent persons in the story. It is further to be remembered that the Resurrection day was necessarily one of great excitement. Events and experiences, as the tale was told, would be mingled, blended, grouped, in a way which no one who was not an eye-witness, like St. John, would be able afterwards clearly to disentangle. Yet the essential facts, and even the chief details of the story, would stand out beyond all reasonable question. This is what we would expect in the narratives of the Gospels, and what, in fact, we find. No one of the Evangelists professes to give a complete account of everything that happened on

¹ Acts i. 22, ii. 32, iii. 15, iv. 33, 1 Cor. xv. 15.

² Acts ii.—iv.

that wonderful Easter morning and day. Each selects and combines from his own point of view ; gives outstanding names and facts, without disputing or denying that others may have something else to tell ; in default of more exact knowledge, sometimes generalizes. It is here that St. John, with his more precise and consecutive narration, affords valuable aid,¹ as he does so frequently in matters of chronology in the Gospels.

In narratives of this description, however credible in origin and substance, it is clearly as hopeless as it is unfair to adopt the methods of a pettifogging attorney, bent at all costs on tripping the witness up on small details. No two of the Evangelists, e.g., agree precisely in the terms they employ as to the time of the visit of the women to the tomb.² Yet in all four it is plainly implied that the visit took place in early morning, when dawn was merging into day, and that it was full daylight before the visit was completed. One Evangelist names certain women ; others add a name or two more—names familiar in all the accounts. How small such points are as the basis of a charge of irreconcilable contradictions ! How few statements of public events, even where stricter accuracy of expression is aimed at, could endure to have such methods applied to them !³

Two examples may illustrate.

Prof. Huxley was a man of scientific mind, from whom

¹ It is possible to agree with Renan here. "In all that concerns the narrative of the Resurrection and the appearances," he says, "the Fourth Gospel maintains that superiority which it has for all the rest of the Life of Jesus. If we wish to find a consecutive logical narrative, which allows that which is hidden behind the allusions to be conjectured, it is there that we must look for it" (*Les Apôtres*, p. ix.). Attention may again be drawn to R. H. Hutton's essay on "The Historical Problems of the Fourth Gospel" (*Theol. Essays*, No. vii.).

² On this and the next example, see after.

³ Critics are always girding at the doctrine of "verbal inspiration." Yet their own objections rest on the postulate of the narrowest view of verbal inspiration, and lose their force on any other hypothesis.

accurate statement in an ordinary narrative of fact might justly be expected. It happens, however, that in Huxley's *Darwiniana* the scientist makes two references in different papers to the origin of the breed of Ancon sheep. It is instructive to put the two passages side by side.

Here is the first :—

With the 'cuteness characteristic of their nation, the neighbours of the Massachusetts farmer imagined that it would be an excellent thing if all his sheep were imbued with the stay-at-home tendencies enforced by Nature on the newly-arrived ram, and they advised Wright to kill the old patriarch of his fold, and instal the Ancon ram in his place. The result justified their sagacious anticipations.¹

Here is the other :—

It occurred to Seth Wright, who was, like his successors, more or less 'cute, that if he could get a stock of sheep like those with the bandy legs, they would not be able to jump over the fences so readily ; and he acted upon that idea.²

Here, manifestly, are "discrepancies" which, on critical principles, should discredit the whole story. In the latter narrative we have Seth Wright alone ; in the former, neighbours ; ["the second narrative," we might say in the usual style, "knows nothing of neighbours" ; the longer version is plainly a later expansion.] In the latter, the idea is Seth Wright's very own—the product of his own 'cuteness ; in the other, the 'cuteness is wholly in the neighbours, and Seth Wright only acts on their advice. Yet how contemptuously would any sensible person scout such hypercriticism !

A second instructive example is furnished in a recent issue of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*.³ A class in history was studying the French Revolution, and the pupils were asked to look the matter up, and report next day by what vote Louis XVI. was condemned. Nearly half the class reported

¹ *Darwiniana*, pp. 38-9.

² P. 409.

³ Oct. 1907, pp. 768-9.

that the vote was unanimous. A considerable number protested that he was condemned by a majority of one. A few gave the majority as 145 in a vote of 721. "How utterly irreconcilable these reports seemed! Yet for each the authority of reputable historians could be given. In fact, all were true, and the full truth was a combination of all three." On the first vote as to the king's guilt there was no contrary voice. Some tell only of this. The vote on the penalty was given individually, with reasons, and a majority of 145 declared for the death penalty, at once or after peace was made with Austria, or after confirmation by the people. The votes for *immediate* death were only 361 as against 360. History abounds with similar illustrations.¹

It helps, further, to set this question in its right light, if it is kept in mind that the Gospel narratives take for granted the Resurrection of Jesus as a fact universally accepted, on Apostolic testimony, and aim primarily, not at proof of the fact, but at telling how the event came about, and was brought on that Easter morning to the knowledge of the disciples, with the surprising consequences. It is not evidence led in a court of law, but information concerning an event which everybody already knew and believed in, which they furnish. This explains, in part, their naïve and informal character. It reminds us also that, while the value of these narratives, as contributing to the evidence of the fact, cannot be exaggerated, the certainty of the fact itself rests on a prior and much broader basis—the unfaltering apostolic witness.² The origin of the Christian Church, it

¹ As an example of another kind, reference may be made to Rev. R. J. Campbell's volume of *Sermons Addressed to Individuals*, where, on pp. 145-6 and pp. 181-2, the same story of a Brighton man is told with affecting dramatic details. The story is no doubt true in substance; but for "discrepancies"—let the reader compare them, and never speak more (or Mr. Campbell either) of the Gospels!

² As shown in a previous paper, the *belief* in the Resurrection is admitted

will hereafter be argued, can simply not be explained except on the assumption of the reality of the fact. Meanwhile it is to be inquired what credit attaches to the Gospel relation of the circumstances of this astonishing event which has changed the whole outlook of the generations of mankind upon the future.

Let the chief points be taken in order, and their credibility examined. The force of the objections of a destructive historical criticism can then be tested.

A first fact attested by all the witnesses is that *Jesus died and was buried*. St. Paul sums up the unanimous belief of the early Church on this point in the words : "That Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried."¹ The reality of Christ's death, as against the swoon theories, was touched on before, and need not be re-argued. No one now holds that Jesus did *not* die !

"He was buried," St. Paul says. How He was buried is told by the Evangelists. The facts must have been perfectly well known to the primitive community, and the accounts in all four Gospels, as might be expected, are in singular agreement.² Combining their statements, we learn that Joseph of Arimathæa, an honourable councillor (Mark and John), and secret disciple of Jesus (Matthew, John), a "rich man" (Matthew), one "looking for the kingdom of God" (Mark, Luke), "a good man and a righteous" (Luke), begged from Pilate the body of Jesus (all four), and, wrapping it in a linen cloth (all), buried it in a new (Matthew, Luke, John) rock-tomb (all) belonging

on all hands. R. Otto, in his *Leben und Wirken Jesu*, says : "It can be firmly maintained : no fact in history is better attested than, not indeed the Resurrection, but certainly the rock-fast conviction of the first community of the Resurrection of Christ" (p. 49). It is here! contended that the belief is inexplicable, under the conditions, without the fact.

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.

² Matt. xxvii. 57-61 ; Mark xv. 42-7 ; Luke xxiii. 50-6 ; John xix. 38-42.

to himself (Matthew, cf. John), in the vicinity of the place of crucifixion (in "a garden," John says), and closed the entrance with a great (Matthew, Mark, implied in the others) stone. St. John further informs us that Nicodemus assisted in the burial, bringing with him costly spices. Phraseology differs in the accounts, and slight particulars furnished by one Evangelist are lacking or unnoticed in the others. St. Mark alone, e.g., tells of Pilate's hesitation in granting Joseph's request, and alone relates that Joseph "bought" a linen cloth. Yet the story, on the face of it, is harmonious throughout, and what any Evangelist fails to state the rest of his narrative generally implies. St. Luke and St. John do not even mention the rolling of the stone to the door of the tomb (the fact was one so well known that it could be omitted). But it is told how the stone was found removed on the Resurrection morning.¹

What has historical criticism to say to this story? One method is simply to deny or ignore it, and to aver, in teeth of the evidence, that the body of Jesus was probably cast by the Jews to the dunghill,² or otherwise disposed of. This, however, is generally felt to be too drastic a procedure, and the tendency in recent criticism has been to accept the main fact of Joseph's interment of the body of Jesus,³ but usually with qualifications and explanations which deprive the act of the character it has in the Gospels. Professor Lake's book may again serve to illustrate the process. According to this writer, the narrative which, to the ordinary

¹ Luke xxiv. 2; John xx. 1.

² Thus Strauss, Réville, etc. Réville, quoted by Godet, says the Jews perhaps cast the body of Jesus on the dustheap, and adds, "as was generally done with the bodies of executed criminals." Godet points out that "such a custom was not in conformity with Jewish or Roman law" (*Defence of the Christian Faith*, E. T., p. 106).

³ Thus Renan, H. J. Holtzmann, O. Holtzmann, Prof. Lake, etc. Strauss allows that Roman law permitted the handing over of the body to friends (*Ulpian*, xlviii. 24).

eye, reads so harmoniously is honeycombed with contradictions. The variations and omissions in the accounts form, indeed, a difficulty in the way of the Marcan theory—e.g., the omission of St. Mark's mention of the hesitation of Pilate (Matthew, Luke), or of the names of the women at the tomb (Luke)—but this is got over, or minimized, by the suggestion of an "Ur-Markus."¹ Then the path is open to assume that St. Matthew's "rich man," and St. Luke's "good man and righteous," are but varying interpretations ("paraphrases") of St. Mark's "a councillor of honourable estate";² that the discipleship of St. Matthew, said to be unknown to, and in contradiction with, St. Mark, is an attempt to find a "motive" for the burial;³ that St. Luke, by the use of the term "hewn in stone" (λαξεύτω) contradicts the description of the tomb in the other Synoptics;⁴ while St. John goes still further astray in regarding the tomb as "a kind of mausoleum,"⁵ etc. "The discipleship ascribed to Joseph in John [as in Matthew] is not really to be reconciled with the Marcan account."⁶ The probable truth is held to be that Joseph, a member of the Sanhedrim, and acting as its representative,⁷ was moved to do what he did solely by regard for the precept in Deuteronomy xxi. 22 ff.: that the body of a criminal hanged on a tree should be buried before sunset.⁸

But how far-fetched and distorted is all this theorizing! The contradictions in the narratives hunted out with such

¹ *Res. of Jesus Christ*, pp. 52-4.

² Pp. 50-1.

³ Pp. 48, 50, 61, 173, etc.

⁴ Pp. 51. "In Mark we have an ordinary rock-tomb; in Luke, a tomb of hewn stone; in John, a mausoleum with a place for the body in the centre" (p. 176).

⁵ Pp. 172-3.

⁶ P. 172.

⁷ Pp. 177, 182. Mr. Burkitt, on the other hand, seems to question that βουλευτής means a member of the Sanhedrim, and hints that St. Luke has here again mistaken St. Mark (*Gospel History*, p. 56). There is no reason to doubt Luke's accuracy in his understanding of the word.

⁸ Pp. 130, 182.

painstaking zeal simply do not exist. To take first the question of discipleship. If the *word* "disciple" is not used by St. Mark and St. Luke, is not the *fact* of discipleship to the degree intended—a secret sympathy now coming to avowal—written across their narratives as plainly as across those of St. Matthew and St. John? What else but discipleship of this kind could move a member of the Sanhedrim ("he had not," St. Luke tells us, "consented to their counsel and deed."¹), on the very day of Christ's crucifixion, to come boldly forward ("having dared," St. Mark says²), to ask from Pilate the body of the Crucified; then, having bought linen, to wrap it therein and give it reverent burial in a rock-tomb (according to St. Matthew, his own;³ according to St. Matthew, St. Luke, St. John,⁴ new)? Indeed, does not the very expression used by St. Mark and St. Luke, "looking for the kingdom of God," imply, *for them*, a measure of discipleship?

Is it probable, Professor Lake asks, that a disciple would have been a member of the Sanhedrim, or have omitted the anointing?⁵ "If Joseph was not a disciple, he probably did not anoint the body; if he was, he probably did."⁶ Then the absence of the mention of the anointing in St. Mark is taken as a proof that Joseph was not a disciple. But in St. Matthew's narrative, where the discipleship is asserted, there is no anointing either. On Professor Lake's showing, it should nevertheless be presupposed.⁷ "Mark

¹ Luke xxiii. 51.

² Mark xv. 43.

³ Matt. xxvii. 60.

⁴ Matt. xxvii. 60; Luke xxiii. 53; John xix. 41. "In the first Gospel," says Strauss, "Joseph is a disciple of Jesus—and such must have been the man who, under circumstances so unfavourable, did not hesitate to take charge of His body" (*Life of Jesus*, iii. p. 297). Renan follows the narratives without hesitation, including the anointing (*Life of Jesus*, chap. xxvi.).

⁵ *Ut supra*, p. 171.

⁶ P. 173.

⁷ In another place he says, "He [Matthew] had given an explanation of the burial [by Joseph of Arimathæa—discipleship—which rendered it improbable that the latter had omitted the usual last kindnesses to a dead

says that Joseph was a member of the Sanhedrim, and that he did not anoint the body."¹ St. Mark makes no such statement. What Professor Lake converts into this assertion is an inference of his own from a later part of the narrative, where St. Mark speaks of the purchase of spices by the women with a view to *their* anointing on the first day of the week.²

The attempt to make out a discrepancy about the tomb is even less successful. In the adjective *λαξεύτω* in St. Luke Professor Lake seems to have discovered a signification unknown to most students of the language. One asks, by what right does he impose on this word, occurring here alone in the New Testament, a sense contrary to that of the corresponding word in the other Gospels? In the one case in which it occurs in the LXX (Deut. iv. 49), it cannot well mean aught else than hewn out of the rock. Meyer appears to give the meaning correctly, "hewn in stone, therefore neither dug nor built."³ But the tomb, it is objected, was not necessarily Joseph's own, as St. Matthew affirms. Surely, however, the very use of it for the burial of the Lord's body, which all the Evangelists attest, is the strongest of proofs that it was. The tomb was evidently one of some distinction. Three witnesses describe it as "new," "where never man had yet lain" (Matthew, Luke, and John), and it was situated in "a garden."⁴ Can those who write thus have thought of it as other than the property of the councillor who used it? Or was it the custom in Judaea for people simply to appropriate anyone's rock-tomb that

friend's body" (p. 61). St. Matthew should at least be cleared of contradiction to St. John.

¹ P. 171.

² Mark xvi. 1.

³ *Com. in loc.* On Jewish tombs and burial customs, cf. Latham, *The Risen Master*, pp. 33-6, 87-8, and plates.

⁴ John xix. 41.

pleased them ? ¹ Professor Lake finds a discrepancy even in St. Luke's omitting to mention the closing of the door with a stone ! But he adds in a footnote : " But the stone is implied in Luke xxii. 2. Either St. Luke forgot his previous omission or the latter was, after all, accidental ! " ²

The futility of the counter-explanation offered of Joseph of Arimathæa's action hardly needs elaboration. Is it credible that any member of the Sanhedrim, without living sympathy with Jesus—still more the Sanhedrim as a body or their representative—should behave in the manner recorded from the simple motive of securing that a criminal who had undergone execution should be buried before sunset ? The answer may be left to the reader's own reflections.

Connected with the burial is the story of *the guard at the tomb*, narrated only by St. Matthew ³—therefore lacking the breadth of attestation of the main history. It is not, on that account, as is very frequently assumed, to be dismissed as legendary. If it has behind it the authority of St. Matthew, it is certainly not legendary ; even if not his, it may come from some first-hand and quite authentic source. It will fall to be considered again in connexion with the events of the Resurrection. Meanwhile it need only be remarked that its credibility is at least not shaken by many of the objections which have been urged against it. ⁴ If the Gospel narratives are to be believed, the action,

¹ Cf. Ebrard, *Gospel History*, E.T., p. 446 ; Godet, *Com. on St. John*, E.T., iii. p. 282. O. Holtzmann's theory of the Resurrection, as will be seen later, turns on the very point that the tomb was Joseph's (*Leben Jesu*, p. 392). A. Meyer's conjecture (*Die Auferstehung*, p. 123) that the tomb was a chance, deserted one, not only contradicts the evidence, but is out of harmony with St. Mark's narrative of the loving care shown in Christ's burial. The circumstance that St. John gives the proximity of the tomb as a reason for the burial (xix. 42) in no way contradicts the ownership by Joseph.

² *Ut supra*, p. 51.

³ Matt. xxvii. 62-9 ; cf. xxviii. 4, 11-15.

⁴ See these in Meyer's *Com. on Matthew*, *in loc.*

teaching, and miracles of Jesus—including the Resurrection of Lazarus ¹—had made a deep impression on the authorities. Especially had the events of the past week stirred them to the depths.² Had they not on the previous night condemned Jesus for a blasphemous claim to Messiahship? Had not mysterious words of His about the building of the temple in three days been quoted against Him?³ Had the betrayer dropped no hints of sayings of Jesus in which, repeatedly, He had spoken of His being put to death and rising again the third day?⁴ If such things came to the ears of the chief priests and Pharisees, as it is implied they did, do they not furnish sufficient motive for what followed? Herod's conscience-stricken thought about Jesus, that He was John the Baptist risen from the dead,⁵ shows that such ideas as Resurrection were not far to seek. Even if the guilty consciences of those responsible for Christ's crucifixion prompted no such fears, was not the fact that the body had been committed to Christ's friends enough to create the apprehension that His disciples might remove it and afterwards pretend that He had risen? It was with this plea that they went to Pilate and obtained the watch they sought. To make security doubly sure, they sealed the tomb with the official seal. The sole result, under providence, was to afford new evidence for the reality of the Resurrection.

The events of the Resurrection morning itself now claim our attention. But a minor point already alluded to, connecting the Resurrection narratives with those just con-

¹ Cf. John xi. 47-57.

² Matt. xxi. 12-16, xxiii., xxvi. 3-5, etc.

³ Matt. xxvi. 61; Mark xiv. 58; cf. John ii. 18-22.

⁴ Matt. xvi. 21, xvii. 22, 23, xx. 18, 19 (so Mark, Luke).

⁵ Matt. xiv. 2; Mark vi. 14-16; Luke ix. 7-9. O. Holtzmann accepts and builds upon the genuineness of these sayings (*Leben Jesu*, p. 388). So earlier, Renan, in part (*Les Apôtres*, ch. i.).

sidered, viz., the *purpose* attributed to the holy women by two of the Evangelists¹ of *anointing the body of Jesus*, may first be touched on. In regard to it several difficulties ("contradictions") have been raised.

There is first the supposed inconsistency between this intention of the women of Galilee and the fact recorded by St. John alone,² that the anointing had already been done by Joseph and Nicodemus, with lavish munificence, at the time of burial. The women were present at that scene.³ Why then should they contemplate a repetition of the function? Then contradictions are pointed out in the narratives of the Synoptics themselves, inasmuch as St. Matthew, from a motive which Professor Lake thinks he can divine,⁴ omits this feature altogether, while St. Mark places the purchase of the spices on the Saturday ("when the Sabbath was past"),⁵ and St. Luke on the Friday⁶ evening. Are these difficulties really formidable? In a fair judgment it is hard to believe it. The difficulty is rather with those who suppose that St. Matthew, with St. Mark's Gospel before him, designedly omitted or changed this particular, or that St. Matthew and St. Luke, both copying from St. Mark, fell into contradiction with each other,⁷ and with their source. Grant independent narration, and the difficulties mostly vanish.

¹ Mark xvi. 1; Luke xxiii. 56, xxiv. 1.

² John xix. 39, 40. Strauss elaborates this objection. Renan finds no difficulty.

³ Matt. xxvii. 61; Mark xv. 49; Luke xxiii. 55.

⁴ *Ut supra*, p. 61. The motive, as stated above, is that St. Matthew presupposes an anointing by Joseph. He has also a guard at the tomb. A. Meyer (*Die Auferstehung*, pp. 108, 111) contents himself with the guard.

⁵ Mark xvi. 1.

⁶ Luke xxiii. 56.

⁷ St. Luke is thought to have been ignorant of, or to have momentarily forgotten, the Jewish method of reckoning days—a likely supposition (p. 59). Is it not St. Luke himself who tells us in verse 54: "And the Sabbath drew on" (Greek, "began to dawn")?

With reference to the first point, it should be observed that, in strictness, St. John, in his narrative of the burial, says nothing of "anointing." The "mixture of myrrh and aloes" need not have been an ointment, and the language of the Gospel, "bound it [the body] in linen cloths with the spices,"¹ suggests that it was not.² But not to press this point, the circumstances have to be considered. The burial by Joseph of Arimathæa was extremely hurried. The permission of Pilate had to be obtained, the body taken down, linen and spices bought, the body prepared for burial and interred, all within the space of two or three hours—possibly less.³ It was probably cleansed, and enswathed within the linen sheet or bandages with the spices without more being attempted. There was plainly room here for the more loving and complete anointing which the devotion of the women would suggest.⁴ Probably this was intended from the first. It is not, at least, surprising that their affection should contemplate such an act, and that steps should immediately be taken, perhaps a beginning of purchases made, to carry out their purpose.

Next, with respect to the alleged Synoptic inconsistencies, Professor Lake being witness, St. Matthew's text, albeit silent, does not exclude, but presupposes, such an anointing—if anointing it was—as that described by St. John.⁵ Much less, surely, can it be held to exclude the intention, recorded

¹ John xix. 40. Luthardt comments: "Probably¹ of pulverized gum, myrrh and aloe-wood, that was strewn between the bandages" (*Com. in loc.*). St. Luke distinguishes, as a physician would, between "spices" and "ointments" (xxiii. 56).

² Cf. Latham, *The Risen Master*, pp. 9 (quoting Ellicott), 36–7.

³ The haste was due to the nearness of the Sabbath (Mark and Luke).

⁴ If, in modern custom, wreaths were placed on the grave of a friend in a hurried burial, would this preclude the desire of other mourners, who had not earlier opportunity, to bring *their* wreaths? or would they carefully reckon up whether enough had not already been done? Cf. Ebrard, *Gospel History*, p. 446.

⁵ *Ut supra*, p. 61.

in St. Mark and St. Luke, of the women to anoint—a circumstance probably left unnoticed because never carried into effect,¹ or because soon overshadowed by greater events. The point is very immaterial as to when precisely the purchases of spices were made. The “internal probability,” as Professor Lake would say, is that the purchases were commenced in the short space that remained before the Sabbath began, and were completed after the Sabbath ended. Most likely some women made purchases at one time, others at another. In stating, however, that “they returned, and prepared spices and ointments,”² St. Luke is probably not intending to fix any precise time: perhaps had not the means of doing it. The next verse [“And on the Sabbath they rested, according to the commandment”] as the *μὲν* shows, and the R.V. correctly indicates, begins a new paragraph.

With the narratives of the wonderful events of the Easter morning, which are next to be considered, the core of the subject is reached. It is conceded on all hands that the Resurrection narratives present problems of exceptional interest and difficulty. It is not simply the so-called “discrepancies” in the narratives which create the problems. These, as said before, may prove to be of minor account. What are they all compared with the tremendous agreement in the testimony which Strauss himself thus formulates: “According to all the Gospels, Jesus, after having been buried on the Friday evening, and lain during the Sabbath in the grave, came out of it restored to life at daybreak on Sunday”?³ The problems arise from the fact that now, in the historical inquiry, an unequivocal step is taken into

¹ The reasons assigned by the critics are quite gratuitous. St. Matthew has in view, like the others, an anointing for burial (cf. the story of Mary of Bethany, chap. xxvi. 13. Strauss makes adroit use of this incident for his own purpose, *New Life of Jesus*, ii. pp. 397–8).

² Luke xxiii. 56.

³ *New Life of Jesus*, i. p. 397.

the region of the supernatural. Naturalism or supernaturalism—there is no escape from the alternative presented. There are consequently two, and only two, possible avenues of approach to these narratives, and according as the one or the other is adopted, the light in which they appear will be different. If they are approached, as they are by most “moderns,” with the fixed persuasion that there is, and can be, no resurrection of the dead, it is impossible to avoid seeing in them only a farrago of contradictions and incredibilities. For it is undeniably a supernatural fact which they record—the revivification of the Son of God, the supreme act of triumph by which the Redeemer of the world, through the might of the Father, resumed the life He had voluntarily laid down.¹ The element in which they move is the supernatural—the earthquake which opens a path from the tomb and scatters the guards; angelic appearances and messages; manifestations of the Risen Lord Himself. If nothing of this can be accepted, the narratives, with the faith which they embody, and the effects of that faith in history, remain an enigma, incapable, as the attempts at the reading of their riddle show, of solution.²

Here then, a choice must be made. If Strauss’ dictum, “Every historian should possess philosophy enough to be able to deny miracles here as well as elsewhere,”³ is accepted, it becomes an insult to intelligence to speak of the narratives as evidence of anything. If, on the other hand, with scope for the discussion of details, the presence

¹ John x. 17, 18; cf. Matt. xx. 28, etc.

² Justly has Prof. F. Loofs said: “He who has never felt that, with the message, ‘Christ is risen,’ something quite extraordinary, all but incomprehensible to natural experience, has entered into the history of the world, has not yet rightly understood what it is to preach the Risen One” (*Die Auferstehungsberichte*, p. 7).

³ Quoted by Godet, *Com. on St. John*, iii. p. 323.

of the supernatural in the heart of the narratives is frankly acknowledged, harmony speedily begins to manifest itself where before there was irreconcilable confusion. As R. H. Hutton, a man of no narrow intellect and a cultured judge of historical evidence, puts it: "The whole incredibility which has been felt in relation to this statement [the Lord's Resurrection] arises, I imagine, entirely from its supernatural and miraculous character. . . . A short statement of how the matter really stands will prove, I think, that, were the fact *not* supernatural, the various inconsistencies in the evidence adduced of it would not weigh a jot with any reasonable mind against accepting it."¹

It is in this spirit that the discussion of the Resurrection narratives will be approached in succeeding papers. The evidence will be taken as it is given—not with the *a priori* demand for some other kind of evidence, but with the aim of ascertaining the value of that actually possessed. It will be fully recognized that, as before allowed, the narratives are fragmentary, condensed, often generalized,² are different in points of view, difficult in some respects to fit into each other, yet generally, with patient inspection, furnishing a key to the solution of their own difficulties—receiving also no small elucidation from the better-ordered story of St.

¹ *Theol. Essays*, 3rd Edit., p. 131. The whole essay should be consulted.

² In illustration of what is meant by "generalizing," the following may be adapted from Ebrard (*Gospel History*, pp. 450-1). A friend is at the point of death. On returning from a journey, I am met in succession by different persons, one of whom tells me of his illness, two others inform me of his death, while a fourth gives me a parting message. In writing later to an acquaintance, I state briefly that on my way home I had met four friends, who had given me the particulars of his illness and death, and conveyed to me his last dying words. Of what interest would it be to the recipient of the letter to know whether all the friends came together, or separately, which came first and which brought the message? In the same way, it mattered little to the readers of the Synoptic Gospels to know whether the women all went together to the grave, or whether one went before the rest, etc. Yet in this lies most of the difficulty.

John. In contrast with the extraordinary treatment accorded to them by the newer school, the study, it is hoped, will do something to create or strengthen confidence in their credibility.

JAMES ORR.

THE PARABLE OF THE LABOURERS IN THE VINEYARD.

THIS parable, as we now have it, is enclosed within two texts which form, as it were, the title and the conclusion. They are Matthew xix. 30 : *But many shall be last that are first, and first that are last* ; and Matthew xx. 16 : *So the last shall be first, and the first last*. That the words in these two verses mean precisely the same thing is obvious, though supposed differences between the two have not infrequently been suggested. Words to the same effect occur in Mark ix. 35, x. 31, Luke xiii. 30 ; in each case it can be shown that the connexion is the same as in the verses before us ; this applies also to their occurrence in the *New Oxyrhyncus Sayings* ; that the saying in question concludes with these words " shows that the speaker is discouraging undue confidence in reference to the final award."¹ That in the Matthaean passages this meaning is present is certain, only it is felt that here they have a further meaning, and express in very pregnant manner the teaching of the parable we are about to consider. Allen, in his recent admirable commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel, says : " The connexion of this clause (xix. 30) with the preceding is obscure in Matthew and in Mark. It would seem that the πολλοί must refer to Christian disciples. All will inherit life everlasting, but many who are now first shall then be last. . . . The ambiguity lies in the ' first ' and ' last.' Does He mean,

¹ Swete in the *Expository Times*, xv. p. 492.

‘ Many who first became My disciples will find greater difficulty of entry than many who followed Me at a later period ’ ? Or is the *πρῶτοι* used of rank rather than of time : ‘ Many who now seem to hold a position of privilege will then find themselves in the lowest place ’ ? Luke (xiii. 30) has similar words in a different connexion. . . .”¹ From all this the present writer feels himself bound to dissent ; if the interpretation of the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard here offered be correct, it will be seen that Matthew xix. 30 embodies the teaching of the parable, which is organically connected with all that precedes, from ix. 16 onwards, and that therefore there is no obscurity in the connexion between this clause (xix. 30) and the preceding verses, nor in the parallel Mark x. 31 ; nor is there any ambiguity in the “ first ” and “ last ” ; moreover, it will be seen that the words as they occur in Luke iii. 30 teach precisely the same lesson as this parable.

It is the case with the majority of the parables that they must be read with their context if their real meaning is to be apprehended ; for it so often happens that a parable is a pictorial presentation of teaching which has gone just before ; and in such cases, to take the parable out of its surroundings, and to seek to explain it by itself, involves the danger of misunderstanding its point, or at all events results in an inadequate comprehension of it. This has often been the fate of the parable with which we are concerned.

The section Matthew xix. 16–xx. 16 forms a complete whole ; the concluding words of this section—*So the last shall be first, and the first last*—may be an editorial addition, but there does not seem to be sufficient justification for assigning the account of the events which led up to the parable, and the parable itself, to different sources ;² the

¹ *The Gospel according to St. Matthew* (International Crit. Com.) p. 213.

² So Allen.

whole is too closely connected, and must, therefore, belong together. The sequence of events in this section is very briefly as follows : A certain man comes to our Lord and asks what he must do to attain eternal life ; in reply, he is told to keep the commandments ; he says he has kept them all, and adds : " What lack I yet ? " Our Lord answers that he is to sell all that he has, and give to the poor ; but when the young man heard this he went away sorrowful ; for he had great possessions. That is, as it were, the first scene ; it forms the *raison d'être* of the words that follow, in which Christ emphasizes how difficult it is for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven : " It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." These words are meant, in a realistic way, to express the idea of impossibility ; it is the beginning of the lesson which the parable is intended to teach ; for in reply to the question, " Who then can be saved ? " our Lord says : " With men this is impossible, but with God all things are possible." As will be pointed out presently, according to Jewish ideas it was by no means an impossibility for men to effect their own salvation. There follow then the words of St. Peter, words which (according to the present interpretation) were the *immediate cause* of the parable : " Lo, we have left all, and followed thee ; what then shall we have ? " In reply, Christ tells of the reward which shall belong to all who have given up anything for His sake ; but what is of paramount importance is to notice that there is included in this reply the words, " But many shall be last that are first, and first that are last. For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an householder . . ." ; it is the parable of the labourers in the vineyard which follows. The whole of the parable, that is to say, is included in the reply to St. Peter's question : " What then shall we have ? " For the Apostle's words imply that he

had a right to expect a reward for the good deeds which he had done. This was of the very essence of Judaism ; and it was one of those things which constituted a fundamental antagonism between the covenant of the Law and the covenant of grace.

It will be well to examine, in the briefest possible way, the main points of the Jewish teaching on this subject. Although the literature from which this is gathered is considerably later in date than the time of Christ, there is no sort of doubt that it embodies material of much earlier times, and that a great deal of it goes back to pre-Christian times. Concerning the special teaching that is to be referred to here, it will be sufficient to see the contrast to it in the Pauline Epistles in order to realize that it belongs to a much earlier time than that of its earliest literary form, as far as we know what that was.

It is to be expected that among a people who regarded the Law (*Torah*) with a veneration second only to that offered to God Almighty the essence of righteousness should consist in the observance of the precepts of the Law. What the Jew had to do to become צַדִּיק ("righteous") was to accumulate מצוות ("commandments"); this was done, in the first place, by carrying out in literal fashion the commandments of the Law ; when, for example, he "laid" his phylacteries, as the modern Jewish term for this ceremony is, or saw to his fringes (צִיצִית), he was said to have accomplished a מצוה ; and this was so much to his credit. In the second place, it was reckoned as a מצוה if the *intention* to fulfil it, without actually accomplishing it, was present ; on the other hand (according to *Kiddushin* 39b, 40a) the desire to do an evil deed, though not accomplished, was not regarded as sinful ; evil thoughts were not sinful, that is to say, provided they were not carried out in action ; this is an important fact when one recalls Christ's words in the Sermon on the Mount.

A third way of accumulating מַצְוֹת was by *refraining* from evil ; every time a man was in danger of committing a sin, and withstood the danger, it was reckoned as a good deed. But then there was another consideration ; it was manifestly impossible for any one to live wholly without sin, that was recognized ; and so it became the aim of every man so to accumulate מַצְוֹת that their sum would outnumber the sum of his evil deeds. When the מַצְוֹת were more than the evil deeds a man was regarded as righteous (צַדִּיק), while if the latter preponderated, he was regarded as wicked (רָשָׁע). So far, therefore, it is a question of the balance between good and evil deeds ; but the point of cardinal importance is, of course, the relationship which was believed to exist between God and the righteous on the one hand, and God and the wicked on the other ; the latter do not concern us here, it is only with the righteous that we have to do. When a man had so accumulated מַצְוֹת as to be regarded as righteous (צַדִּיק) he was said to be in a state of זְכוּת (*zecuth*) ; this word is Talmudic, but a closely allied form (זָכוּ) occurs in Daniel vi. 23 (22 E.V.), where it has the restricted sense of "innocency." In the Talmud it means much more than "innocency" ; and although in the time of our Lord the later, more fully developed meaning of the word had probably not yet arisen in its entirety, it seems certain both from the passage from the Gospels which we are considering, as well as from the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, that the *idea* which the word connotes in later Jewish theology was already prevalent. When a man was in a state of זְכוּת, it meant that the number of מַצְוֹת which he had accumulated was such as to enable him to stand justified in the sight of God, and therefore to be in a position to *claim* his reward from God. In view of this fact there is immense significance in the words of St. Paul when he says, for example : "By the works of the Law (*Torah*) shall no flesh

be accounted righteous in his sight” ;¹ or again : “ We reckon, therefore, that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the Law (*Torah*) ” ;² or, once more : “ Not of works, that no man should glory.”³

From what has been said, then, it would seem that when St. Peter asked, “ What then shall we have ? ” he implied that he had a right to demand his reward, for he had said just before, “ Lo, we have left all and followed Thee.” Christ tells him that there is to be a reward for this, but immediately goes on to say : “ But many shall be last that are first ; and first that are last. For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is a householder, etc.” Evidently, therefore, there is a close connexion between the parable and the events which precede it. And this is clear from the parable itself, the main points of which are as follows :—

The householder is represented as one in an independent position from the point of view of the labourers ; this fact is obvious when one considers the conditions of the time, when the respective positions between rich and poor was so entirely different from that of modern times ; nowadays, moreover, although there is a very distinct dependence on the part of the workman upon his employer, it is nevertheless of an utterly different character from the relationship that existed between the two in Judaea at the commencement of the Christian era. Extremely obvious as this is, it nevertheless needs emphasis in order that one may insist upon the fact that the householder in this parable is independent of the individual labourer. This fact is further implied in the words which speak of other labourers standing idle in the market-place ; and also in the words : “ Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own ? ” Since, therefore, the householder is wholly independent of the individual labourers, the *advantage* of their being employed lies primarily with them ; each individual

¹ Rom. iii. 20 ; Gal. ii. 16.

² Rom. iii. 28.

³ Eph. ii. 9.

labourer must consider himself fortunate in being employed, and thus placed in a position in which he is enabled to earn a livelihood. That is to say, that the householder is conferring a boon on the individual labourer by employing him, it is an act of grace on the part of the former. We read of the householder going out to seek other labourers at the third, sixth, ninth and eleventh hours ; this fact shows, in the first place, that for the purposes of the teaching of the parable the supply of labour is represented as, generally speaking, more than equal to the demand ; and this further emphasizes the independence of the householder as regards the individual labourers ; and in the second place, it must be noticed that this seeking of labourers at all times of the day is apparently not taken from actual life ; or, at all events, that the procedure here described was exceedingly exceptional, for a householder would obviously have a general idea of the number of labourers he would require during the day, and would hire them early in the day, and not have to be running out constantly right up to the eleventh hour to seek more. That is to say, this *trait* seems to have been put in for a specific purpose ; it is a case in which improbable, or at least unusual, circumstances are brought in to arrest the attention of the bearers, and thus to emphasize something more than usually important. This is borne out by the further unusual proceeding of giving the same payment to all the labourers, whether they had worked all day or only for an hour. The murmuring of those who had worked all day is quite comprehensible, for under ordinary circumstances they might well feel justified in expecting that all would receive payment according to the amount of work done. It is, of course, urged in reply to this that each labourer made his special arrangement with the householder, and that therefore the payment which others received was no concern of his ; but it must be allowed that in the ordinary conditions of life it is

manifestly unfair for the man who has worked all day to receive no better payment than he who has worked only for an hour. But, of course, the whole purpose of this parable is to place before men circumstances which are not those of every-day life in the ordinary sense. To explain the parable by saying that it teaches that the quality of work done is of more value than the quantity is beside the mark, for there is nothing to show that the work of those labourers who had laboured all day was in any sense inferior in quality to that of those who had only worked an hour ; besides, this explanation ignores the very essence of the teaching which the parable contains. The murmurings of the labourers was justified from their point of view ; but they are represented as forgetting the antecedent fact that their being employed at all and being thus placed in the advantageous position of earning their livelihood, was an act of grace on the part of the householder ; it was easier for those labourers who had only worked for an hour to realize this, but one and all, the first as well as the last, were partakers of what was the real advantage to each, namely, the privilege of working for the householder ; in this respect an act of grace was shown to all alike. Whatever was done when *in* that service, was of quite subordinate importance as compared with the *fact* of being in that service ; and the capacity of serving the householder arose, of course, only by virtue of having been taken into his service.

So that what the parable teaches seems to be this : The householder is entirely independent as regards each individual labourer, and therefore the fact of his seeking them to work in his vineyard is an act of grace on his part so far as each individual labourer is concerned ; in order to emphasize the fact that this is an act of grace, he goes out at various hours of the day to offer the advantage of employment to other labourers, who would otherwise have nothing to do.

The following words are significant : " Why stand ye here all the day idle ? They say unto him, Because no man hath hired us." When the time for payment comes, some of the labourers murmur, and claim more payment on account of their having worked all day, but the householder shows that their clam is unjustifiable in the words : " Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own ? " the reference being not to the *amount* of wages paid, but to the fact of paying any wages at all, i.e., taking into his service, which was that which constituted the act of grace on the part of the householder ; the claim for more implied a right on account of work done, whereas the possibility of doing any work at all was an act of grace ; and therefore the claim was unjustified.

The application of the parable would then seem to be this : The fact that Christ accepts the service of disciples is an act of grace on His part ; and it is wholly for the benefit of these that they are received into the service of Christ ; for He does not require it ; as far as He is concerned He is altogether independent of the service of men. Nevertheless He seeks men that they may serve Him ; but if in return men conceive themselves to be justified in *claiming* a reward for this service—" What then shall we have ? "—they are ignoring the great facts that the capacity for doing Christ service is an act of grace on His part, that the reward promised is of grace and not of merit, and that the idea of supererogatory works—which the Jewish theologians laid so much stress upon—was without meaning. They were ignoring, that is to say, facts which the teaching of Christ was constantly drawing attention to : " Ye have not chosen Me, but I have chosen you " ; " Without Me ye can do nothing " ; " When ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants ; we have done that which it was our duty to do." ¹

¹ Luke xvii. 10.

The factor which is of prime and overwhelming importance is, to be taken into the service of Christ ; and since this is an act of grace, the stress is laid upon the *fact* of its taking place, rather than upon that of *when* it takes place ; for, once in that service, the last comer is equally the participant of grace as the first ; and the good works that are done in the service of Christ lie in the natural orders of things, they are analogous to what in ordinary life are the every-day and obvious duties which men do without thinking about ; therefore “good works,” both because the doer is actuated by divine grace and because he is doing nothing but what he ought to, can never be “meritorious,” in the sense of any one being justified in *claiming* reward.

If this interpretation of the parable be correct, it will be seen that it must have been specifically directed against the Jewish doctrine of works, as pointed out above ; a doctrine which the words of St. Peter, “What then shall we have ?” succinctly expressed ; and a doctrine which would be wholly annihilated by such words as, “The last shall be first, and the first last.” It is a doctrine which forms the antithesis to the Christian doctrine of grace. And it strikes at the root of the whole of Christ’s redemptive work on earth, for if it lies within the competency of man so to accumulate good works as to enable him to arrive at a state of *צדקה*, and thus, as it were, to compel God to give the reward both here on earth and also hereafter, it is obvious that the Incarnation, Suffering and Crucifixion of Christ would have been entirely unnecessary. This thought is clearly brought out by St. Paul, for example, in his Epistle to the Galatians v. 4 : “Ye are severed from Christ, ye who would be justified by the Law ; ye are fallen away from grace.” It is extremely instructive, indeed, to notice how identical the teaching on Grace is in the Gospels and in the Pauline Epistles.

According, therefore, to the interpretation of the parable

of the Labourers in the Vineyard here suggested, it was not intended to teach merely the rather obvious truth that the divine reward is given in accordance with the quality and not in accordance with the quantity of work done, nor that its object was "that of warning Christ's first disciples that others who should become His disciples at a later date would also be partakers of privileges equal to theirs who had first joined Him."¹ Both of these explanations are no doubt implicitly taught in the parable; but its prime purpose was to show that Christ had come to inaugurate a new relationship between God and men, or rather, to declare more fully what that relationship really was and always had been. No man could, by virtue of his works, *claim* a reward from God, for the capability and the will to do them came from God—"What hast thou that thou hast not received?"—the initiative is not man's; no man, therefore, could be justified in the sight of God by his own merit. It is by means of divine grace that the desire to do good works arises, it is by divine grace that power to accomplish those works exists, and it is by divine grace that the reward for them is accorded.

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

ST. LUKE'S ACCOUNT OF THE LAST SUPPER: A CRITICAL NOTE ON THE SECOND SACRAMENT.

2. INTERNAL CRITICISM.

THE only internal difficulty that I can find stated as to the passage is this. St. Luke speaks, according to the text that possesses "overwhelming external evidence," of our Lord as blessing *two* Cups, and of the blessing of the Bread as having taken place *between* them. Thus we find ourselves face to

¹ Allen, p. 214.

344 ST. LUKE'S ACCOUNT OF THE LAST SUPPER :

face with alternative difficulties. If we retain the words in question, we must believe that our Lord blessed two cups, and that He used with the *first* one words that occur in St. Matthew's and St. Mark's narratives after the *second*. If we reject the doubtful passage, we must believe that St. Luke reverses the order of the two elements. If we retain the two accounts in St. Luke, we must believe that our Lord said, "I will not drink henceforth, etc.," and yet that He consecrated and (by assumption) drank of a *second* cup. If we reject them, we must suppose that our Lord, from St. Luke's point of view, due (according to Dr. Wright) to local custom, consecrated the wine first, and thereby bring St. Luke into absolute contradiction, not only with his brother Synoptists, but with his friend and master St. Paul. Dr. Plummer, reviewing the evidence in the light of the canon of internal criticism, which declares that *the more difficult reading is to be preferred*, admits that the difficulty presented by the retention of the words is greater than that presented by their omission; i.e., that the "Two Cups" theory would present more difficulty to scribes of the early centuries than the "One Cup" view,—and yet he drops the words simply because he believes it safer to move along the path of least resistance, by getting rid of *all* the difficulties involved in retaining the suspected passage. This is obviously contrary to all canons of criticism. To drop a passage with overwhelming external evidence, simply because of its internal difficulties, is contrary to the canon, "Internal evidence follows external." To abolish a passage that does not contain *in itself* any gross difficulties is mere presumption. To do so because it is easier to understand the meaning without it (if it be easier, in this case, which I greatly doubt) is sheer contradiction of the canon, "The more difficult reading is to be preferred." To do so, when there is *no* rival reading, but simply a very poor case for omitting the

words, is contrary to the rules, alike, of common-sense and criticism.

We may, however, deal better with the passage by a thorough examination of all the objections that can be made to it. And, in doing so, we must remember that "more difficult" has two meanings, too often confused. In one case it means, "more difficult for us"; in the other, "more difficult for the writer in whose text the disputed words occur." We cannot argue at all from the first meaning—the long interval between our Lord's days and our own has cleared out some difficulties, but it has made others still harder to understand. We can argue on sound grounds from the second, because we can often judge how far either general circumstances, or local customs and traditions, or apparent discrepancies between different portions of Scripture, may have made a particular reading difficult to men who were uncritical as to both Scripture and services, and took everything without much inquiry.

Looking then at the objections that may be made against the genuineness of the passage, point by point, and remembering that we must weigh them against an overwhelming mass of external evidence, we may state them as follows :

(α') The passage may have been added because of the difficulty involved in St. Luke's *order* ; or

(β') It may have been *omitted* because of the difficulty presented by the idea of *two* cups.

(γ') The fact that the passage is Lucan (or Luco-Hebraic) in vocabulary has, by some strange contortion of Reason, or by the "*difficilior præferetur lectio*" canon, been urged against its authenticity.

(δ') So also has the parallelism between these words and St. Paul's account,—an objection on account of *resemblance*.

(ϵ') So has the fact that the passage is not parallel to the other accounts, an objection on account of *difference*.

(\mathfrak{E}') So has the idea that, if we accept a belief in two cups, and attach our Lord's words, "I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine," to the first, our Lord cannot have drunk of the Eucharistic chalice.

(ζ') Against the "two cup" objections that the inversion in St. Luke's account, of the order of Consecration is unaccountable, a theory is advanced in S G that the Evangelist probably followed "a local custom."

Taking these points in succession, and remembering (1) that, if we suppose either the addition or the omission to have been made, as it were, half-accidentally, there is exactly the same chance of accident in each case; (2) that if the codex which was the parent—near or remote—of B and \mathfrak{N} were within the reach of the people, the addition of words to a well-known formula would have caused even more scandal than their suppression in a minor group headed by D; (3) that the scribe of \mathfrak{E} —the supposed parent codex of B and \mathfrak{N} —cannot well have done his work later than the third century; and (4) that (as has already been pointed out) there is no probability (and most obviously no certainty) of a text constructed on the system followed in WH being final: we have a perfectly sound basis for internal criticism. The case then stands as follows.

(1) α' and β' can be treated together; they simply call on us to decide between the strength of two motives, or of two opportunities. Looking at the case objectively, it is plain that the temptation to remove the words must have been slighter than the other, since they are retained by all the best MSS., etc., and omitted by only a very few MSS. of a very poor school. Subjectively, there would be every temptation to remove an aberrant passage, on the ground that it seemed an unauthorised addition; but the addition, in the third century, of extra words to the New Testament Eucharistic formulae would have seemed a blasphemy.

The scribe of Ξ , whenever it was written, kept the aberrant passage—the account of the first cup; it is therefore highly improbable that he added the disputed words as to the second cup.

(2) The canon, “*Difficilior præferetur lectio*,” obviously rests on a principle behind it, the principle that deliberate or semi-deliberate tampering with an important text is generally due to a conscious or half-conscious desire to remove difficulties: and this canon prevails only when stronger evidences are equal, or nearly equal. We have already seen that, in this particular case, the external evidence for the “two-cups” theory is overwhelmingly superior; but, even if it were not, the difficulty presented to the scribe of Ξ by retaining the disputed passage would be much greater than that caused by its removal. In the latter case, there would be only the difficulty caused by the divergence of St. Luke’s *order* from that of the other three accounts, a comparatively trifling¹ matter. In the former, there would be the enormous difficulty of the use of *two* cups, a thing nowhere else mentioned in Scripture. So the *subjective difficulty* of (β') would have been far greater than that of (α'); and, so far forth, the canon, “*Difficilior præferetur*, etc.,” confirms the external testimony.

(3) Under γ' we can clearly see that a difficulty evident on the surface would have been far greater, to an early scribe, than one that could be reached only by careful internal criticism. For us, the case is reversed. He could not, except by a *Kritik* that was difficult, and probably beyond his powers, find any objection to the passage on the ground of its parallelism in vocabulary to *Hebrews*. On the other hand, the “two cups” difficulty would have been at once obvious to him. But we, especially those of us who accept

¹ No difficulty at all, if Dr. Wright’s theory as to local differences in custom could be accepted.

the Lucan authorship of *Hebrews*, cannot fail to notice that the three words *ποιεῖτε*, *ἀνάμνησις*, and *διαθήκη* are not merely present in the vocabulary of the Epistle, but are used in technical senses which, at least, help to illustrate their use here. *ποιεῖν* is familiar enough: "By faith he *kept*" (or "*sacrificed*") "the Passover" (Heb. xi. 28). The word *διαθήκη* (Covenant) is not only a keyword in the Epistle, but almost *the* keyword. And *ἀνάμνησις*, which Farrar, with his peculiar carelessness, declares to be absent from all New Testament Scripture except in this passage and the parallel passage in 1 Corinthians,¹ occurs in a very remarkable passage in *Hebrews*, the only verse in the New Testament that helps to throw any light on the words here. The passage possesses the peculiar alliterativeness that is common to St. Luke's other writings and the Epistle, and the use of the word is obviously based on its technical sense in the LXX. "ἀλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, ἀδύνατον γὰρ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράγων ἀφαιρεῖν ἁμαρτίας." "But in these there is a *Remembrance*" (or "*Memorial*") of sins made yearly, for it is impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sins" (Heb. x. 3). Thus the character of the vocabulary would have formed—to an early scribe—no objection to the passage, while, to us, it is a strong argument for its retention.

(4) The same argument, more or less, applies to δ' and to ε'. Both objections imply that a difficulty found by research would have been stronger than one on the face of the Lucan story,—the use of the two cups. We take it that the copying of codices was not so much the occupation of Fathers and students of "comparative" New Testament theology as of godly men who wrote fair uncial characters and copied with general accuracy. Again, is there any sufficient reason why men of this kind should try to harmonise by

¹ *Cambridge Greek Testament, S. Luke*, p. 371.

creating a greater difficulty? It is obvious, too, that it is hardly consistent to contend that a resemblance to one account and a difference from another should be alike reckoned difficulties: but we, who more thoroughly realise that St. Luke was St. Paul's physician and close friend, and that each of these great men acted on and was influenced by the style of the other, can see a good reason why St. Luke's record should be like St. Paul's, and more or less unlike those of the first two Synoptists. Here, as in (3), the objection itself helps us to an argument in favour of the genuineness of the disputed passage, an argument possessing all the extra weight belonging to a *confirmation* that could not have been worked out at the time when the original codices, Ξ and the unknown parent of D, were written, but can be thoroughly worked out by the critical apparatus at the disposal of us children of a later age.

(5) Against the fuller Lucan account and its correspondence with that of St. Paul, the only real objection urged is that St. Paul, though he retains the order of the first two Synoptists, (or, to use a modern phrase, "the Marcan tradition"), yet speaks of the Elements in the opposite order in another passage. "The cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not a partaking of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not a partaking of the Body of Christ?" We might retort on the exponents of the single canon "*Difficilior præferetur lectio*," that, in this case, there would be a strong reason for supposing that St. Paul had, in the passage just quoted, reversed the true order. But it is not necessary to go so far. We may say (i.) that a deliberate history is more likely to follow its author's ideas as to details than a casual remark, especially as the question of order does not seem to be of any importance for the purpose of reference. (ii.) St. Paul, however, seems to have had a plain reason for the adoption of the reverse order in this passage. It is

followed by the words (translating them correctly), "Because there is one loaf, we, who are many, are one Body, because we are partakers of the one loaf." I hope to show, later on, that there is a peculiar importance attaching to this latter passage. At present it is enough to say that St. Paul—a master in both style and thought—followed both the natural logic of thought and a sound principle of style in speaking last of the "loaf," as he was about to write further concerning the loaf. (iii.) St. Paul, in his historical account (which he seems to claim as "received" by him in some special way, if not as directly inspired), by his explicit use of the phrase "the cup *after supper*," not only makes it impossible to reconcile his statement with the abbreviated Lucan account, but also seems to confirm, strongly or weakly, the possibility of the use of two cups.

(6) We cannot neglect the fact that, in the universally acknowledged account of what I believe to have been the *first* cup, St. Luke says "δεξάμενος ποτήριον," "having *received* a cup." In the disputed part, he, like St. Paul, uses no verb. St. Paul allows the missing verb λαβών (*taking*) to be inferred from his description of the consecration of the loaf; St. Luke may very well have done the same. The other Synoptists use "taking" for both the loaf and the cup. If there were a variant reading, the use of a strange verb would be a strong motive to early scribes to change it to the usual verb,—to us, the fact would be rather a reason for retaining δεξάμενος. But there is no variant reading. (i.) The obvious inference is that the early scribes accepted δεξάμενος because λαβών was already present, by implication, in another part of St. Luke's narrative. (ii.) This is quite consistent with the fact that λαβών and δεξάμενος have really different meanings. The absolutely uniform use of λαβών in connexion with the Eucharistic loaf and cup seems to imply that Christ *took* both from the Table Himself;

δεξάμενος, that He *received* the cup from the hands of some one else. The two accounts are not consistent with the "one cup" theory, but they are quite consistent with the "two cup" view. For we know (among other things) that, both at present and for a period that probably included the time of our Lord's ministration, there are and were several different cups used at the "Memorial Passover," which, by the way, Jews have always carefully distinguished, both in meaning and in ritual, from the actual original Passover kept at the Exodus.

(7) Up to this I have, perhaps, seemed to assume—without giving my reasons—that there is an antecedent historical authority in favour of the use of two cups. A young Oxonian friend summed up the contrary opinion by telling me that "nobody believed there were two cups" at the original Institution of the second Sacrament. So, perhaps, it may be as well to state the plain facts.

It is absolutely certain that the Jews now use *five* cups at different periods of the festal supper, beginning with a cup before eating, and ending with another cup after the meal is over. Dr. Farrar (who, on this point, is really an authority) states this definitely, and gives good reason for believing that it was so in the time of our Lord. To be sure, we do not know the actual details of the Paschal feast as then observed, but we do know that the wine was an unauthorised, though perfectly appropriate, addition to the bare rules of the law; and, knowing this, it is easier to believe that more cups than one were used in our Lord's time than that a single cup has multiplied into five since then. To use a phrase of St. Paul's, "Nature herself" would tell us that the eating of a roast lamb with unleavened bread would be impossible without some liquid refreshment during the feast, as well as after it: and there is no suggestion of and no conformity with Eastern custom in

the use of any other kind of refreshment besides wine. Besides this, several passages in *Ecclesiasticus*—a book which our Lord certainly knew and often referred to—show us that the Jews had, before our Lord's time, begun to speak habitually of a feast as "a banquet of wine." This does not imply excess, as the wines used by the Jews (as well as those drunk by the Romans) were low in alcoholic strength, and were never used without mixing with water: though, in view of another question, we may say that both the Apocrypha and the New Testament imply that men could get drunk on them. A parallel case is the German *Helles Bier*, on which a student cannot get drunk until he has passed the stage of getting sick after his fifteenth glass; but he faces the situation bravely, and gets drunk somewhere between the fifteenth and the thirtieth. There is therefore no historical difficulty in the fact that two cups are mentioned by St. Luke. On the contrary, the real difficulty is that no one else mentions them. But all imply them, either in the reference to "this fruit of the vine," or (as St. Paul) by the differentiation of the last cup as "the cup after supper." We have already seen that the transference of St. Matthew's and St. Mark's *final* words, which follow the direct history of the actual Institution, to the beginning, where St. Luke unites them with the "receiving" and blessing of the first cup, gives them a definite meaning and enables us to harmonise the whole narrative. We may now take a further step. Farrar, though he gives no reason, identifies the former cup with the *third* cup of the Passover: St. Luke, if we follow the longer text, joins this cup and its blessing with our Lord's words concerning the feast in general, spoken at the *beginning* of the feast. This arrangement, too, is absolutely symmetrical: "I will no more eat thereof, etc."; "I will not drink henceforth, etc." Perhaps some critics may con-

sider the fact that the reception of the fuller account makes a double symmetry between the words and actions at the beginning and those at the end of the feast an evidence of want of authenticity : I confess that, to me, the accidental bringing out of a symmetry so beautiful and significant seems to point the other way, especially as it coincides with a remarkable set of facts, whose meaning we could not understand without the witness of Jewish ceremonial. It is one of these facts that obliges me to differ from Farrar as to the former cup. The blessing (or thanksgiving—for all Jewish “blessings” are blessings of God, not of things) belonging to the *first* cup still runs, “Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, Who hast created *this fruit of the vine.*” This seems to identify, absolutely, the first cup of St. Luke with the first Paschal cup ; it helps to strengthen the case for the transference of St. Matthew’s and St. Mark’s references to “this fruit of the vine” to the beginning of the feast ; and it makes the whole story, in St. Luke’s longer account, absolutely consistent. So, too, the Jews still call the *last* cup of the Passover “the Cup of Blessing,” doubtless because of its association with the final “grace” or “benediction” of the feast. St. Paul, as we have seen, speaks also of “the Cup of Blessing,” even where he speaks of the cup first. It is entirely unnecessary to do more than mention the wisdom of that greatest disciple of Gamaliel in all matters of Jewish customs, and the close accuracy of that greatest follower of the good side of Pharisaism—Pharisees were simply Jewish Stoics, and even the Stoics had a great deal of good mixed up with their fatalism, the parent of Pharisaic predestinarianism—in everything that pertained to the rites and ceremonies belonging to the Church of Israel, which he left for better things, but loved to the end.

(8) We may now pass on to the next objection. It is

said (5') that, if we accept the theory of two cups, we must also accept the implication that our Lord did not Himself drink of the Eucharistic chalice. Is this necessarily true? And is it necessary to believe that He Himself either ate the Eucharistic loaf or drank from the Eucharistic cup? (i.) We cannot fail to notice that, as the story is told by St. Luke, our Lord made a precisely similar statement as to the Passover—or Paschal meal—which His Apostles were about to eat with Him. Both *may* mean “from this moment,” and both *may* mean “after this feast.” But it is absolutely impossible to take the two statements in different senses. If we accept the first meaning, we must believe that our Lord neither ate nor drank anything at the “Last Supper”—which is possible. If we accept the second, He certainly may have eaten and drunk at the feast, and there is no reason why He should not have drunk from the last cup as well as from the former ones. (ii.) But there is no possible proof, either in or outside the disputed words, that Christ either ate the Eucharistic loaf or drank from the Eucharistic cup. Scripture is strangely reticent on the point. It is true that in both the Anglican and the Roman Use, and, so far as I know, in every Use that has ever existed in Christendom, the Celebrant *must* communicate, whosoever else may fail to do so. This might be taken as evidence that our Lord also communicated. But there is one immense difference between that First Eucharist and every one of its successors. Whatsoever “grace” may be given or meant in the Eucharist, the Celebrant needs it as much as any one else. He, in a manner, represents Christ; he speaks the words Christ spoke, and performs the actions Christ performed; he gives God’s message of peace and goodwill and Eucharistic blessings (whatsoever these may be) to the people. In the Church of England service the Confession is ordered to be

said by "one of the Ministers," i.e., clergy assisting at the Celebration, if there be any, so that the Celebrant cannot say the Confession unless he is celebrating alone. The rubric (which orders the *Minister* saying the Confession, and the people, to kneel) seems to preclude him even from kneeling if he does not say the Confession. The Roman Rite is somewhat different, but only because the Confession and the Absolution that follow are not "Sacramental," the actual Confession and Absolution having been made and given beforehand. In the Constantinopolitan Rite the Confession is whispered, very briefly, in the priest's ear, and an equally brief Absolution given at one of the doors leading into the sanctuary. But amid all varieties of Use, all Christians of every Church know that the Celebrant is as much in need of the Sacrament as any of his flock. From the Pope to the youngest curate of an Anglican Church, all need grace, because all are sinners. But Christ committed no sin, and was pure in Thought, Word and Deed, the very Wisdom, the very Strength, the very Beauty of God—the very God Himself in human form. True Man, He prayed, thanked the Father, did in all good things as His brethren did and do; and He received from the Father, as we all receive, power and knowledge: He tells us so Himself. But He did not need grace; He did not need any further spiritual blessings, seeing that the Father gave Him the Spirit "without measure," and that He was, as He is now, the very Fount of Grace. Therefore He *need* not have received the Eucharist He gave, though, as a matter of fact, we do not know whether He actually did so or not. (iii.) If (as I believe, and there are many strong authorities to support me) the Last Supper was celebrated *before* the time when the Paschal lambs were killed, there was no lamb on the Table. This helps us to understand the meaning of Holy Communion. *He made Himself the*

true Paschal Lamb. This being so, there was every reason why He should *give* "His Body" and "His Blood" (to quote simply His own words) to others ; but it entails a strong improbability against His eating the mystic feast itself. So, to sum up the answer to this objection, we may say that the words commented on do not necessarily bear the interpretation put on them ; that we do not know, from any source, whether our Lord Himself ate of the Holy Loaf and drank the Cup of Blessing, and that there are several grounds on which it may be reasonably believed that He ate and drank neither. The weight of evidence is, therefore, on this point, against those who urge the objection.

(9) As to the possibility of St. Luke's having followed a "local custom" in the *order* of his description, there are two separate difficulties to be met. Did such a local custom ever exist ? If so, for how long a time did it prevail ? Under the first question we must ask another, Why does St. Luke himself show no sign of any such custom elsewhere ? We are fully justified in identifying the writer of the Third Gospel with the author of—at least—the prologue and the latter part of the Acts : and I at least believe that the hand of the same writer shows, broad and deep, on every page of the Epistle to the Hebrews. We have already seen that St. Luke was with St. Paul at the time of the writing of 1 Corinthians. Now, in *all* of these works there is strong evidence that the author put the loaf, in his thoughts, before the cup. We need not go further into the aberrant passage in 1 Corinthians. But we may safely say that in the latter part of the Acts (and in the earlier, for that matter) the "breaking of the loaf" is so strongly marked as to throw the second element into the shadow,—that neither St. Paul nor his secretary seems, at the time when 1 Corinthians was written, to have even

heard of such a local custom,—and that such testimony as is afforded by the Epistle to the Hebrews is against the idea of such a custom existing. The account in 1 Corinthians (as we have seen) strongly resembles St. Luke: if the relative dates allowed us, we could find no objection to its being an excerpt from the Lucan account. It is, at least, an excerpt from the knowledge common to St. Paul and St. Luke: and it follows the same order as St. Luke, if we believe that the first cup mentioned by the Evangelist was *not* Eucharistic. In the Epistle to the Hebrews, again, the allusions to the Eucharist are few, but they are somewhat striking. The writer dwells upon the thought of the Christian Altar as one from which “those who serve the Tabernacle” could not *eat*: I can remember no passage in which he speaks of drinking from the cup; and, most curiously, when he has occasion to speak of the Incarnation, He seems to reverse the order of “flesh” and “blood” deliberately. The reading is certain; he says, “Inasmuch as the children were *partakers of blood and flesh*, etc.” There seems to be only one possible explanation of this. (*a*) The phrase “My flesh and blood” (found in St. John) was already familiar in connexion with the Eucharist; (*β*) the word “*partakers*” suggested the act of communion. St. Luke, therefore, avoided any possible confusion between the “partaking” in the Eucharist and the “partaking” in the Incarnation, by simply reversing the order of the *words*. Is it, then, probable that he (or St. Paul) knew of any “local” custom which would justify him in inverting the order of the acts of Consecration? St. Paul’s nescience as to any such custom goes further. In 2 Corinthians he places the order of the elements as all Christendom knows them now, “And so let him eat of that loaf and drink of that cup.” So, too, in describing the disorder of the *Agapê* at Corinth, when the “hungry navvies” (to use a phrase for which I

must thank Dr. Wright) ate and drank with indecent and profane haste the consecrated Elements and the "Love-feast" together, St. Paul deems it a sufficient description of their sin to say that they ate, "not *separating out*" (*διακρίνων*, A.V., "discerning") "the Lord's body." If he knew of any "local custom" to the contrary, he surely would not have allowed his readers merely to *infer* the presence of and the offence against the second Element. St. John's mystic sayings, again, are against the theory of a "local custom." He indeed gives our Lord's descriptions of Himself as the "Bread of Life" and as the "True Vine" separately; but, when both Elements are alluded to, the "Bread" comes first. "My Flesh is meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed." "Whoso eateth not my flesh nor drinketh my blood, etc." ¹

Again, there is no trace of any such local custom in Church history before, during, or after, the age of the great Codices. We may say, then, and say with safety, that there is no evidence of a custom, local or otherwise, of an inversion in the *order* of Consecration having ever existed, anywhere or at any time, except at the present day in Dr. Wright's fertile imagination. But there is, as we have seen, abundant evidence of the use of several cups at the Paschal feast, and we have already seen that there is, at the least, a very high probability of St. Luke's *first* cup corresponding to the first of these, and of his having put the *first* cup and the *last* each in its proper place. To me it is harder to explain why the two earlier Synoptists should have left the first cup unmentioned than why St.

¹ Dr. Wright is perfectly certain that these and other words in St. John apply to the Eucharist, and bases on them a theory that Christ instituted a special method of "breaking bread" near the beginning of His ministry. He ought to have observed that, on this theory, the sacramental use of the cup must have been also an early institution of Christ's, and that the order, as fixed by St. John's quotations, must have been constant from the beginning.

Luke should have mentioned a thing so obviously belonging to the feast : but, in all probability, the omission is due to the fact that they did not find it necessary to speak of what every one knew, more especially because there must have been *some* risk of a confusion between the first cup and the real chalice.¹

(10) Finally, we may put together several facts corroborative of the belief that the suspected passage in St. Luke must be genuine. The question as to the possibility of scandal from omission or addition works both ways : it gives us no grounds for forming an opinion, and simply throws us back on external evidence. We have already seen that *no* existent New Testament text can claim to be final. The disputed words certainly existed in the fourth century codices, and, if they were inserted, they must have been inserted long before that period. On the other hand, their omission cannot well have taken place until at least the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century, (since D's omission of the words is corroborated by no earlier codex), so that belief in their authenticity has at least antiquity in its favour. We cannot, of course,—until a thorough exploration of all the early Fathers and Liturgies has been made—urge “General Acceptance” in favour of the disputed passage ; but the great Codices are the

¹ In some countries, after the Roman Catholic Church had ceased to give the chalice to the laity, a draught of *unconsecrated* wine was administered to the sick, to facilitate the deglutition of the Host. That custom *might* lead, under certain circumstances, to a confusion between this draught and the consecrated wine. So, too, in the purely Missionary days of Christianity, the mention of the *first* Cup might lead to a confusion between it and the true “Cup of Blessing.” This seems to me a sufficient reason for both the omission of the first cup in the Matthew-Markan accounts, and for the transference of the blessing of the first cup to the end of the narrative. If the later accounts were maimed, either in the papyri or on parchment, between their first appearance and the time of the exemplars of the great Codices, the well-known (and, in itself, justifiable) tendency to de-paschalise the surroundings of the Eucharist would give a strong *subjective* motive for the omission in the first two Synoptists.

nearest approach we can get to the general acceptance, at their date, of words that have certainly been almost universally accepted ever since.

Joining these latter points with the examination of internal probability that precedes them, and adding to all this the further fact that the external evidence in favour of the disputed words is overwhelmingly convincing, no reasonable and unprejudiced thinker could fail to accept as final—so far as any evidence of the kind can be final—the *dicta* of documentary evidence and the plain probabilities of common-sense and internal criticism. These can hardly lie to us; but a system of guess-work that is, from its very nature, capable of being so fashioned as to fit either side in an argument, is, at the least, absolutely unnecessary until the state of the text and the necessity of meeting difficulties that cannot be otherwise explained call us by stern necessity to what is at the best a somewhat hopeless and misleading task.

We may, then, summarise our results. (1) The disputed passage in St. Luke shows every mark, external and internal, of authenticity. (2) Its admission makes it necessary to believe that St. Luke speaks of the Consecration of *two* cups at the Last Supper. (3) St. Luke joins the declaration and the words of blessing of the *first* cup with a similar declaration of our Lord's as to the whole feast. (4) There is no doubt whatsoever as to the *order* in which our Lord consecrated the loaf and the Eucharistic cup. (5) The *first* cup preceded the feast, and was *not* Eucharistic. (6) St. Paul's account *implies* the use of a cup before the Eucharistic chalice; his omission of any reference to that cup is absolutely intelligible. (7) So, too, the omission of any similar *direct* reference in St. Matthew and St. Mark is intelligible, but both have an *indirect* reference, though misplaced. (8) By replacing their reference in its proper order,

the whole account, derived from its four sources, is intelligible and self-consistent, and reveals the Scriptural truth of the tradition that is embodied in the order of Consecration and administration now used through all Christendom.

ALEX. R. EAGAR.

A PLEA FOR THE RECOGNITION OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL AS AN HISTORICAL AUTHORITY.

IN four articles published under the general title "The Scribes of the Nazarenes"¹ I have endeavoured to show by examples that the trustees of the Christian Tradition were Jews after all. They have brought upon me the criticism that it is misleading to over-emphasize the Rabbi in Jesus. To this I take leave to reply that some of the contemporaries of our Lord regarded Him and revered Him as a Rabbi. Pharisees, Sadducees, and Herodians propounded to Him their problems not always nor only with malicious intentions.

That He was more than a Rabbi His followers realized, but He was not less. The title, like that of Scribe, has fallen on evil days and tongues since those early days when the Gentiles were as yet outside the Christian Church. But such popular misconceptions do not constitute a valid objection to the truth of this aspect of our Lord which is put before us in the Gospels. As St. Paul affirmed, *Christ became a minister of the circumcision, that He might make good the promises given to the fathers.*² He came to His own home-folk as Prophet and Rabbi. In His earthly ministry He was one of the order of God's messengers, which He described as including *Prophets, Sages and Scribes*. In His teaching He employed the Scripture as other Scribes. And the records show—for all the generations of Gentiles who have handled them—that He did not disdain to use

¹ EXPOSITOR, March, 1906, July, 1906, January, 1907, March, 1907.

² Romans xv. 8.

Rabbinic methods in expounding it. He was not concerned with Gentiles but with Jews. It does not appear that He taught the Greeks who sought Him in the temple. His message was not self-interpreting even to such near neighbours of the Jews, who by their coming displayed so real a sympathy with their religion. And though the writings of the New Covenant which Jehovah made with His people have been translated into the "Vulgar Tongues" of nations more remote from Palestine, it is possible for them to seize the secret of Jesus and yet not to appreciate the vessels in which it was delivered to the first disciples.

The just appreciation of these earthen vessels demands a sympathetic study of the antecedent and contemporary developments of Judaism. God spoke to His people variously before He spoke to them in His Son. There is, it would seem, a current opinion that the New Testament explains itself and can stand alone, that Jesus (in all senses of the phrase) "spoke as never man spoke" and what man never spoke before. That His teaching contains in itself sufficient guidance for the conduct of life, is indisputable. But if any be concerned to commend the claims of Christianity to the world by other means than the unobtrusive practice of goodness, it is necessary to show that the Memoirs of the Apostles are historical authorities and that the Jesus whom they delineate was apt to time and place and, therefore, credible. The ways and thoughts of the Palestinian Jews, among whom Jesus of Nazareth went about doing good, are not the ways and thoughts of modern Western Christendom. Their simplicity is now labelled subtlety. Their race has been persecuted in the past, and now their books and teaching are either wrested from them or ignored. The early Christians thought of the uniqueness of the personality of Jesus and in large measure at the first ignored His teaching. People talk nowadays of the origi-

nality of the teaching of Jesus. And this mode of talking reacts upon the popular mind. The calendar helps to foster the notion, which once obsessed Marcion of Pontus. The conventions of *Anno Domini* and *Before Christ* exert an incessant and insidious influence upon the unwary.

Dr. Johnson once said to Boswell, "My dear friend, clear your *mind* of cant. You may talk as other people do : you may say to a man, 'Sir, I am your most humble servant.' You are *not* his most humble servant. . . . You may talk in this manner ; it is a mode of talking in society, but don't *think* foolishly." ¹ George Fox realized that talk affected thought and prohibited even meaningless phrases for the sake of their obliterated significance.

Dr. Johnson, I suppose, is the embodiment of robust common sense. As such, he did not always plumb the potentialities of human nature or guard sufficiently against its weaknesses. He was also a thought intolerant of the alien immigrant when he registered the popular verdict in his *Dictionary*. He wrote, for example, this definition :—

"Pharisaical *adj.* [from *pharisee*] Ritual ; externally religious : from the sect of the Pharisees, whose religion consisted almost wholly in ceremonies."

Such unsympathetic common sense, as this definition displays, is not in itself a complete equipment for the explorer of a bygone epoch. The history of the Pharisees proves the injustice of the popular verdict. It is laid down that one should impale the worm as if one loved it : even if he must pronounce a sentence of condemnation, the historian must understand the culprit's motives and axioms, and generally be ready to wear for the nonce "other people's shoes." But Dr. Johnson was a partisan like all true great Englishmen, and therefore incapable of any compassion for "the Whig dogs" and others.

¹ Boswell's *Life of Dr. Johnson* (ed. Birrell, vol. vi. p. 57).

Nemesis attends the tacit acceptance of conventional labels as adequate descriptions of traditional opponents and the complacent neglect of relevant but non-edifying and inaccessible evidence. The Teaching of Jesus becomes original throughout when no other is taken into account. He came *de caelo in synagogam*. Well and good for His disciples of other lands and times. But in their hands the *history* of His earthly life becomes more and more incredible and impossible. The books are rejected by the critics one after another, and Jesus Himself becomes a figment of the imagination—a light that never was on land or sea.

It was not so in the beginning. The first disciples do not lay very much stress upon the Teaching of Jesus. And the explanation is obvious. They knew that it differed little from that of other Rabbis excepting in so far as it concerned Himself and the Father. No sign was given to that generation except the Son of Man, who died voluntarily and was raised from the dead by the Power of God. The Risen Jesus is the Christ, and on *this Rock* the Church and its Catholic faith are founded.

HE SPOKE WITH AUTHORITY.

There is a tradition that Jesus *spoke with authority and not as the Scribes*. From this two inferences have been and are commonly drawn—

(1) That the teaching of the Scribes was not delivered with authority ;

(2) That in this respect the teaching of Jesus differed *toto caelo* from the teaching of the Scribes.

These inferences are not free from difficulty. The Scribes had authority and knew it. Their decisions were binding. They spoke, and their disciples did according to their words. Jesus commanded His own disciples to obey them who sat upon Moses' seat. The Scribes appealed to the authority

of Scripture, which was to them the revelation of God's will and could not be loosed or set aside without Scriptural warrant. It is true that some of the Scribes whose sayings are preserved spoke expressly in the name of their Rabbi, but such sayings bewray the consciousness of an authority greater than that to which the quoted Rabbi pretended. The disciple interprets his Master's word with as much freedom and authority as the said word displayed in its handling of Scripture.

Jesus of Nazareth, on the other hand, was less explicit and therefore *less authoritative*, in His teaching than the other Scribes. He said, indeed, that He spoke nothing but what He heard from God. But any conscientious Rabbi would have made the same claim to divine inspiration, once he was sure that his decisions were justified by the Scripture.

Since the usual inferences from this statement are difficult and dubious it is natural to suggest a re-examination of it in its context.

This description of the teaching of Jesus is appended to a general statement, that *he entered into the synagogue of Capernaum and was teaching. The people were amazed at His teaching.* It precedes the account of the expulsion of an unclean spirit, but is separated thence by the interpolation of the Marcan formula, *And immediately.*

In spite of this separation the Gospel according to St. Mark shows plainly that the impression was *not* produced by the sermon. It is simply the chronicler's reproduction of the cries of the people, who witnessed the subsequent exorcism.—*What is this? New doctrine! With authority He commands even the unclean spirits! And they obey Him!*¹ Jesus used no formula, as the Scribes did, when He expelled demons. He spoke *with authority* and achieved the healing of those who were possessed without adjurations.

¹ Mark i. 27.

This tone of *authority* is extended by the Second Gospel to the general teaching of the Lord ; and this interpretation is endorsed by the First Gospel, which interpolates before the statement the Sermon on [the Mount. Later generations who did not recognize the existence and importance of demoniacal possession acquiesce in this extension of the original report, which even St. Mark endorses.

Nevertheless the Jews of Palestine believed that men were possessed and dominated by devils. The fact bulked large in their imagination. Their Rabbis expelled demons by means of formulae. It was a practical proof of the validity of general religious instruction, which at best appeals only to the potentially virtuous, and produces results which are known only through the evidence of the beneficiaries.

In the Third Gospel the comparison with the Scribes is omitted and the author seems to recognize that the *authority* belongs to something other than the teaching. *His word*,¹ he says, was in authority ; and the witnesses of the exorcism are made to say to one another, *What is this WORD ? For in authority and power he charges the unclean spirits and they come out.*²

Thus the delimitation of the *authority* of Jesus is justified by St. Mark—the reporter must outweigh the chronicler—and St. Luke. The First Gospel reflects the attitude of Christians, who had escaped the perils of demoniacal possession, and had learned in their ignorance to exaggerate the importance of the general teaching of the Prophet of Nazareth.

That St. Mark should preserve the original reference and the actual words, upon which the statement is based, and also transfer it to the teaching, shows that already there was modification of the Gospel tradition. It is not to be doubted that the modification is warranted by the

¹ Luke iv. 32.

² Luke iv. 36.

facts. Jesus of Nazareth did teach with authority to ears which heard.

The thesis of this paper is that this modification went on until St. John intervened. Up to St. John the only Gospels were the work of men who were not eyewitnesses and were dependent upon their material. The only exception is St. Matthew, who collected or composed the oracles. These it is natural to identify with the prophecies of the First Gospel, which are introduced by the formula, *This took place that it might be fulfilled which is written*. Apart from these the Gospel has no claim to the primacy. But in virtue of these it represents the first stage of the *Praedicatio Evangelica*. The Prophetic Word was surer even than an attested voice from heaven in the eyes of the primitive Christians.¹ By such words they demonstrated that Jesus was the Messiah. The Jews demanded such evidence, and the Gentiles, who believed in Oracles as they in prophecy, were prepared to appreciate its force.

The second stage is represented by the Marcan tradition, which is incorporated by the First and Third Gospels. It consists chiefly of incidents selected for audiences who were totally ignorant of Jesus of Nazareth. It is not arranged in order according to the statement of Papias, who was of small intelligence and therefore a good witness to accepted ideas. Events belonging to Galilee are collected together and become more prominent than the collection of events which belong to Jerusalem. This emphasis upon the Galilean Ministry seems to be deliberate. It was probably due to the consciousness that this part of our Lord's life bore the closest resemblance to the work of the Apostles in the world outside Palestine. St. Peter's consequent choice of material is amply justified by the place which the Second Gospel holds in the esteem of

¹ 2 Peter i. 18 f.

modern critics. But St. Luke and Papias realized its incompleteness; and the fact that its ending was lost indicates a general acquiescence in their opinion.

St. Luke is the first Christian historian. His works are addressed to a catechumen, and the address indicates the beginnings of organization. The breathless haste of the first missionaries is over. He has access to untouched sources of information and his method and tone inspire confidence in his judgment. But he is not independent of the Marcan order, and much of the material which he amassed has been demonstrably worked over.¹ His authorities had practised the principle which St. John enunciated—*they believed the Scripture, the Prophecy, and the word which Jesus spoke*. Consequently his reports of the Teaching of Jesus present remarkable variations from the version contained in the First Gospel.

The doubtful mysteries of an oral Aramaic tradition and written Hebrew documents loom vaguely through His Gospel. He delivered what he received; and he received much directly or indirectly from the hands of Christian Pharisees like St. Paul, who were alive to the possibilities of their native tongue and to the connotations and affinities of the *ipsissima verba* of our Lord. The men who shaped the teaching of Jesus, as it is reported by St. Luke, possessed as their birthright that orientation, which others must laboriously acquire. They knew the Scriptures in the original or a cognate tongue, and knew also the value of arguments and associations of ideas, which rest upon a verbal not a logical process. A play on words is still an *argumentum ad hominem*—*γελάτω δ' ὁ βουλόμενος*. And after all an argument which does not reach the man is not worth very much.

¹ See, for example, "The Reed and the Courtier" in *EXPOSITOR*, March, 1907.

To attempt to characterize the Fourth Gospel is at this stage premature. But, if a personal explanation is not indecent, I would venture to indicate the views at which I arrived five years ago and which I hope to commend in these tentative essays, and also the road by which I travelled. The subject was suggested to me for my first course of lectures, and I came to it from two years' exploration of Philo, Talmud and "the Apocrypha." I began with the axiom, that St. John was not to be regarded as an historical authority, and ended with the conviction that the axiom was "condemned as an improbable fiction." The more I learned of pre-Christian and non-Christian Judaism the more forcibly I was convinced that his Gospel was in letter and in spirit a true picture of our Lord as He appeared to a disciple who was capable *pro virili parte* of understanding Him.

It is sometimes said that our Lord wrote only once, and then in the dust. What He wrote then none knows, unless it was indeed the sins of those who hated the woman taken in adultery before Him for judgment. But he wrote also in the hearts of His disciples; and there was one among them whom He loved. This disciple, to whom the Church owes the Fourth Gospel and all its consequences, might well be called the Epistle of Jesus of Nazareth, which is known and read of all men. His authority went far once to determine the right doctrine of the Person of Christ; and it is still indispensable.

MOTIVES AND METHODS OF MODIFICATIONS.

The value of the Fourth Gospel is best seen when it is compared with the Synoptic Gospels. St. Mark, the recognized primary source, is a touchstone by which modification can be detected in St. Matthew and St. Luke. A comparison of St. Matthew and St. Luke reveals modification in the one

or the other according as records of fact and reports of teaching are examined.

This modification is of two kinds—a modification of letter, or a modification of spirit. In the second case the text is rewritten ; in the former case the text is unchanged, but a different sense is read into it. There are different degrees of modification, different methods and different motives to bring it about. But wherever it can be detected such modification illuminates the dark places of primitive Christianity.

There is, for example, a modification of the primitive tradition which proceeds from a growing reverence for certain persons mentioned in the narrative. Jesus Himself is known as *the Lord*. His disciples become more than ordinary men. The Virgin Mary and the Brethren of Jesus are saved from the apparent consequences of their wish to save Him from Himself. And on the other hand the steadfast enemies of Jesus and His followers—despite the later adhesion of the Pharisees to the new faith—are not allowed to act from good or even uncertain motives.

There is again a tendency to expurgate the tradition of anthropomorphic statements about our Lord ; and generally to eliminate non-edifying pieces of the narrative which, after all, are only necessary to the historian. The effect of this tendency is to produce the impression of the miraculous and to cast an air of unreality over the history.

Miracles which cannot be doubted are exaggerated and produce other miracles.

Reference has already been made to the fusion of the words of Jesus with relevant or illustrative prophecies. There is one case at any rate—the Triumphal Entry—in which the record of *fact* also has been coloured by the premature collocation of a Scripture, whose pertinence was not realized till later.

Finally, when the words of Jesus became the new law of life for Christians, the Scribes of the Nazarenes made concessions to human infirmity.

From these modifications—at any rate, from modifications of letter—the Second Gospel is comparatively free. For unwritten modifications of the spirit he cannot be held responsible. St. Mark's report of St. Peter's sermons is invaluable, if it be taken for what it is and not for something which it never pretended to be.

CHRISTIAN LAW OF MARRIAGE.

Our Lord's teaching about Divorce is a good illustration of the comparative value of the Synoptic Gospels and the various objects of those who transmitted the tradition.

St. Luke is concerned with a Catechumen, who should live according to the word of Jesus. For such the decision pronounced is all that is needed. The occasion of the decision and the preliminary stages of the discussion are therefore omitted. St. Luke is content to cite the saying apparently as an illustration of the principle. *It is easier for the heaven and the earth to pass away than for one tittle—to say nothing of a letter—of the law to fall.*¹

In the First Gospel this decision is reported twice over—once in its original context and once, as by St. Luke, alone.² In both cases the teaching of Jesus has been assimilated to that of Rabbi Shammai. Divorce is permitted in the case of adultery. In the face of St. Mark and St. Luke the exception is interpolated. And this though the absolute prohibition of divorce seems to be required by the addition which is peculiar to St. Matthew,³ and is expressly endorsed by St. Paul : *Upon those who have married I enjoin—not I, but the Lord—that a wife do not separate herself from her husband ; but if she do separate herself, let her remain unmarried or be*

¹ Luke xvi. 17 f. ² Matthew xix. 2 ff. ; v. 31 f. ³ Matthew xix. 10–12.

*reconciled to her husband: and that an husband abandon not his wife.*¹ At Corinth it would appear that women were converted to Christianity, whose husbands remained heathen, and that in consequence they sought release from the marriage bond.

St. Mark gives the final decision in all its original severity and with it the circumstances in which it was given. Of the accessories he gives in detail perhaps more and perhaps less than all. He is careful to discriminate between the public and private teaching of Jesus and indicates the new climax law by his usual preface, *Jesus says*.

The narrative is clear and natural enough. Certain persons come to Jesus of Nazareth, whom they regard as Rabbi, or Prophet, or both, and propound the question, *Is it lawful for an husband to put away his wife?* Their purpose is to test Him, to ascertain His attitude towards a problem which could not be settled out of hand because Scripture did not clearly decide it. He answered by inquiring, *What did Moses command you?* The inquiry seems to warrant the supposition that they were not ordinary members of the crowds who gathered round Him, but Scribes who sat on Moses' seat and directed the people as best they could. Their reply consists of the Scriptural warrant which justified the recognized practice. Divorce was legitimate, provided that the regular procedure was observed. So far as the report of their reply goes they followed Hillel's ruling. Jesus responds with the citation of an earlier authority than the Law as given through Moses, just as St. Paul appeals from the Law to the Promise given to Abraham, the first Jew. This Scripture is at least as authoritative as that on which they relied, and it was never formally repealed. The commandment of Moses was not primitive. It was introduced in view of the hard-heartedness of the Israelites. And

¹ 1 Corinthians vii. 10 f.; compare 39 and Romans vii. 3.

the point is driven home by a play on words, which the audience would appreciate. For hard-heartedness is *uncircumcision of heart* and the bill of divorcement which was introduced to cope therewith is strictly *a bill of cutting off*, a formal guarantee of *excision*. The sentence which follows the Scripture seems to anticipate the explanation which our Lord gave privately, as His manner was, to His proper disciples. It is therefore to the reporter, perhaps, that we owe the familiar words, *So that they are no longer two, but one creature. That they which God yoked together let not man sever.*

It may be pointed out in passing that a Jew of the time believed the Scripture would have found no difficulty in finding warrant for the saying. Although the theory be best known by the dubious advocacy of the Platonic Aristophanes, the story of the creation or evolution of Eve indicates the way in which male and female were yoked together in the beginning. Philo says roundly that the first man created was the genus, neither male nor female, in whom both male and female subsisted.

Whether this be an interpolation based upon the sequel or not, St. Mark distinguishes this public teaching, in which Jesus meets his questioners on their own ground and with their own weapons, from the private instruction of His disciples. When they return to the house in which they are staying Jesus gives judgment. Then for the first time it is suggested that a woman might claim for herself the liberty and initiative which custom conceded to men. And the suggestion is made by Jesus Himself in apparent independence, so far as the narrative goes, of the original question and of the questions which arose out of it, when Jesus confronted His questioners with another Scripture and left them to think themselves out of the dilemma.

The Law of Moses did not contemplate the possibility of

a wife's self-assertion. If her husband forfeited his right over her, she lapsed to her father. But the Pharisees had a care for women, and in the Christian sect of Judaism the woman had equal rights with the slave, the Gentile, and the man. It may be that Jesus was thinking of Jewess wives who divorced their husbands—Salome, Drusilla and Herodias. John Baptist denounced Herodias and she retaliated. Josephus was indignant at Salome because she usurped the prerogative of the husband and sent a formal bill of divorce-ment, which coming from a wife amounted to a parody of the Law. But Jesus of Nazareth had followers among womankind who were more faithful than the men. And it is no less possible that He wished to assert the real equality of the sexes which would somewhen be recognized, and put the wife first to counteract the current predominance of the husband.

Now the Fourth Gospel is quite independent of the Marcan tradition, and corrects with authority the impression produced upon readers who regarded it as a chronological history. Its reception indicates a recognition of this authority and of its relation to St. Mark. A chronological history was not needed for missionary sermons. The controversies of the Judæan Ministry were probably unintelligible to heathen and to Hellenist Jews who had not kept in touch with Jerusalem. But there are hints in the Synoptists which show that Jesus did *not*, as they are held to affirm, spend a year in Galilee and then a week in Jerusalem.

It is intrinsically probable that a Prophet would go up to Jerusalem for the Feasts of Obligation and teach there, as Jesus did on St. John's showing. Much of His teaching, which the Synoptists report without indication of scene or time, is more suitable to the metropolis than to the countryside. One thinks at once of the temptation which Jesus told to His

disciples : *Then the devil taketh Him into the Holy City and set Him upon the pinnacle of the Temple and says to Him, If Thou art the Son of God, cast Thyself down.* Hypocrites also abounded in Jerusalem according to the Rabbinic statement, which is evidence of the existence there of a higher ideal and more exacting standards.

And to go no further at present there is evidence that there were disciples of Jesus in Jerusalem to whose practice the whole body of Christians conformed after the Resurrection and final departure of their Lord. Such considerations as these are surely enough to warrant a plea for the impartial reconsideration of St. John's claim to be an historical authority superior to St. Mark.

St. Mark was St. Peter's interpreter. He wrote down accurately what he remembered. He was a reporter at second hand of events and sayings which he saw with St. Peter's eyes and heard with St. Peter's ears. Compared with the Fourth Gospel his narrative, especially as it is reproduced in the First and Third Gospels, is of the nature of a *hortus siccus* or the valley of dry bones. St. John the eye-witness has colour, life and movement, when he tells what he saw of "the mid-sea and the mighty things." His narrative is free from modification. In his report of the Teaching of Jesus he interprets, not as St. Luke's authority by collocation of prophecy, but as the disciple who had read the mind of his Master. His supplements explain the antecedent natural causes of events, which for lack of knowledge had been interpreted as supernatural. In some cases he gives the true version of such events.

THE FEEDING OF THE FIVE THOUSAND.

One example of St. John's correction of existing misinterpretation is presented by his account of the "Feeding of the Five Thousand." This incident seems to mark the

climax of popular enthusiasm for our Lord and it is commonly supposed to be a miracle.

The main points of the Marcan narrative¹ are these. The Apostles have returned from their mission and Jesus bids them come away to a desert or lonely place for a short rest. Their departure was observed by many who detected their distinction and came before them. Jesus was moved with compassion for them and therefore taught them many things. St. Luke adds that he healed those who were in need of healing.

The disciples, who have just returned from their mission, come to Jesus and suggest that He should dismiss these uninvited followers to the hamlets and villages round about, in order that they may buy food. It would seem that the disciples imagined that in their haste these crowds had come unprovided. But the five thousand were not Apostles, who must take nothing for the road.² The commands laid upon the Twelve point clearly to the ordinary equipment of the traveller—*bread, wallet and money*. The faithful preservation of their mistaken impression prepares the reader, who knows that miracles were worked by Jesus, to expect another miracle here.

And so the familiar narrative proceeds. The disciples produce their scanty stock of provisions. Jesus blesses the loaves and breaks them up. He gives them to His disciples to set before the crowd who at His command are now reclining on the grass in ordered companies. The narrative postulates a miraculous multiplication of the food, comparable to that attributed to Elisha; but only because it is incomplete and because the reporter has misunderstood the significance of his notes—after the manner of reporters, even of eye-witnesses.

Jesus commanded them to recline—companies—*green grass*

¹ Mark vi. 30 ff.

² Mark vi. 8.

—they lay down (sat at meat)—*vegetable-beds*—hundreds—fifties. Surely the proper inference is that if these Jews had left behind their usual furniture of *cophinus foenumque* the natural resources of the extraordinarily fertile district supplied their needs. *Green grass* has a wider meaning in the Greek than in the English. The combination τῷ χλωρῷ χόρτῳ recalls the Scripture which speaks of the plant of the field (χλωρόν) and the herb of the field (χόρτον).¹ The latter, at any rate, is prescribed as the food of Adam after his sin—*thou shalt eat the herb of the field*,² φάγη τὸν χόρτον τοῦ ἀγροῦ. Before the Fall it appears that Adam and Eve fed upon the fruit of trees. And χόρτος is everything that is not a tree—as it is written, *And God said, Let the earth put forth grass, herb yielding seed after its kind*—βοτάνην χόρτου . . . and fruit tree . . . *And God said, Behold I have given you every herb yielding seed . . . and every tree . . . to you it shall be for meat*.³

It is possible, therefore, to get from *green grass* not merely a couch or seat but also sustenance. From this it follows that the mention of πρασίαι πρασίαι is not necessarily a mere picturesque description of the separate symposia of fifties and hundreds. Πρασον is a leek; and leeks are reckoned edible. Πρασίαι, leek-beds, would presumably contain vegetables generally, which according to Galen were called χλωρά.

In the Johannine narrative there is no need and no room for a miracle. The subsequent discussion excludes the performance of any sign, which could be likened to the gift of bread from heaven.

A great crowd were following Jesus, because they observed the signs which he did in the case of the sick. Jesus retired to the mountain and there sat with His disciples. The Passover—the Feast of the Jews—was near. These Jews,

¹ Genesis ii. 5.² Genesis iii. 18.³ Genesis i. ii. 29.

who were following Jesus, presumably intended to go up to Jerusalem for the Passover.

Jesus raises his eyes and sees the growing crowd of potential adherents. Perhaps His disciples voice the temptation and suggest that with the aid of these adherents he could establish his kingdom. He tests one of the twelve with the question, Whence are we to buy bread that these may eat? If you think that here is my army, how is it to be fed in the campaign against the Roman power. Philip thinks only of the moment. Andrew, another of the obscure members of "the Twelve," brings forward *a lad* (παιδάριον) who has five *barley* loaves and two fishes (ὀψάρια).¹ The new details indicate an appeal that Jesus would use the power entrusted to Him to convince the crowds once and for all; and perhaps they contributed something towards the transformation of the incident.

But Jesus knew what He would do. He would accept the allegiance of the five thousand men,² but He would not put Himself in their hands. He would give them His bread to eat for a symbol that they were His men; but He would remove Himself and the twelve from the temptation, which this uncertain and ignorant enthusiasm presented to their minds. Somewhen they might remember their forgotten zeal and come at last to know that the kingdom was not of this world and not to be established by force. Then they might be His disciples indeed.

So Jesus took the loaves and Himself distributed them after giving thanks. Perhaps He handed to the captain of each company as much as would enable each man to eat a fragment of His bread. The remnants were carefully collected because they belonged to the Feast of the Nazarenes.

For the rest of the meal they had their own stores to share with one another—and *there was much herbage in the place.*³

¹ See 2 Kings iv. 42-44. ² John vi. 10, οἱ ἄνδρες. ³ John vi. 10.

It is remarkable that a Christian should "rationalize" a reputed miracle and yet that his narrative should be accepted by the Church.

J. H. A. HART.

OPERA FORIS.

MATERIALS FOR THE PREACHER.

IV.

EXODUS iii. 4 :—*God called to him out of the midst of the bush.* Not, out of the midst of the fire. Commenting on Philo's treatment of this incident, Dr. E. A. Abbott observes, in his latest volume (*Indices to Diatessarica*, 1907, p. lxi.), that Philo would probably have said, with the author of the Elijah-story, "The Lord was not in the fire." The bush, symbolizing the oppressed Israelites, had its baptism of fire, but "in the revelation to Moses, as in the revelation to Elijah, the Lord was not in the fire but in the principle of life that made the fire harmless. This principle of life was revealed to Moses in the saying I AM, or rather I WILL BE—which occurs here for the first time in the Bible. At the first utterance, the word is modified so as to be a private or individual revelation (Exod. iii. 12), 'I WILL BE *with thee*.' Then it is used without any reference except to a repetition of itself, I WILL BE [WHAT I WILL BE. This revelation," as Dr. Abbott points out, is ambiguous and neutral in itself. It has caused critics¹ immense difficulty

¹ Thus some (e.g., E. Meyer) regard it as an evasive reply, the speaker putting off the query of Moses (cp. Gen. xxxii. 30). Others explain it as an equivalent for an unchangeable personality, while Professor Cheyne emends it into "Ashhur," a divine name (*Traditions and Beliefs of Ancient Israel*, pp. 530 f.). "No new truth concerning the character of God is given; but Moses had met God Himself, and was thus strengthened to meet Pharaoh. There is an immense difference between 'He' and 'I,' between hearing about God and hearing God. What an interval!" (Erskine of Linlathen to Maurice.)

by its apparently metaphysical tinge. But, when it is read in the light of the unconsumed bush, "it teaches that God who is on the side of the afflicted, and who may be said to be in the midst of the affliction (i.e. the bush), WILL BE ever the champion of the good, ever the Eternal Life, even in the midst of fires that seem to imply death."

This interpretation is quite consonant with what we know of Israel's belief in Jehovah as an outcome of the Mosaic era. Their faith was unique, owing to the character of Him whom they had learnt to know. "Other nations claimed the protection of their God by virtue of a natural bond: Jehovah became the God of Israel by His own free choice. Other gods arose in dim prehistoric times, none knew how; the recollection of the crisis which made Jehovah Israel's God was never lost. Lastly, He had revealed Himself from the first under a moral aspect, as one who punished the oppressor and let the captive go free" (W. E. Addis, *Hebrew Religion*, pp. 63, 64).

The serviceableness of this interpretation for the preacher needs only to be outlined. (1) The fiery trials of the Christian life are not all. They are visible and conspicuous, apparently permitted to waste life without any divine check. But an invisible power prevents them from destroying the faith and patience of the soul. The bush is not consumed. (2) The impersonal troubles of the believing man's life are contrasted with the revelation of a personal will, which overrules and overcomes them. (3) The assurance of God's strong delivering grace, thus won from any crisis, private or public, throws light on His constant and characteristic attitude to the struggling sons of men; it guarantees His aid in all future emergencies.

* * * * *

Exodus iv. 14: *Is there not Aaron the Levite, thy brother?*

I know that he can speak well. And also, behold, he cometh forth to meet thee.

Moses had not thought of Aaron, for members of a household are apt to underrate the powers and possibilities that lie in one another. As Seneca put it, "vile habetur quod domi est." We will look anywhere for help and assistance, sometimes, rather than to the men and women among whom we dwell, simply because familiarity with the latter is prone to blind us to their capacities. We have a trick of not expecting much from our relations. Yet *I know*, whatever you think or do not think, *that he can speak well*. Do not undervalue or ignore his qualities.

Furthermore, *he is coming* at this very moment *to meet thee*. He needs no urging. Any one who will pluck up courage to initiate a movement will be sure to find allies, once he himself begins. Assistance flows in from the most unlikely quarters. The earnest soul, which takes the lead, will not be left alone for long; from unsuspected quarters, even in its own unromantic neighbourhood, that help will start up which by its sympathy and co-operation avails to win the day.

One spirit to command, and one to love
And to believe in it, and do its best,
Poor as that is, to help it—why, the world
Has been won many a time, its length and breadth,
By just such a beginning.¹

An apt parallel to this incident occurs in the second book of the Iliad, where Homer describes how the various Greek chieftains were summoned by Agamemnon to confer with him on the desperate state of the army's fortunes before Troy. Messengers were despatched to all. But the poet adds, Agamemnon's brother required no summons. He was already on his way, instinctively feeling that he

¹ Browning: *A Blot in the 'Scutcheon* (Act ii. scene 2).

might be needed. "Menelaus of the loud war-cry came to him unbidden, for he knew in his heart how his brother toiled."

* * * * *

Psalm i. 6 :—

*For the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous ;
But the way of the ungodly shall perish.*

The first psalm serves as an introduction to the psalter, and these words, which form its climax, are deliberately chosen. Hitherto God's activity has not been mentioned. The poem has been occupied with a description of the pious Israelite, furnished with God's law and maintaining his allegiance to it amid and against unsympathetic neighbours. Now, the psalm closes with a reminder that the issues of this struggle are in higher hands. "It is not without reason," as Gunkel observes, "that this song is placed, like a sort of preface, in front of the psalter, throughout which man's belief in providence plays so large a part. Before we hear the pious folk praying, wailing and rejoicing in the psalter, we get the general proposition, the star and substance of their piety."¹

The Lord knoweth the way of the righteous. He *knoweth* ; that is all, but it is enough. He is not indifferent to the moral conflict. The reverence and the loyalty of the faithful are fully appreciated by Him ; for *to know*, in this sense, means not an abstract knowledge but the practical interest of one who approves and supervises. The man who is careful about his associates and who scrupulously avoids the principles and company of the openly irreligious, may rest assured that, whoever is callous about the matter, his God cares supremely. The temptation is to believe, as the cynical opponent asserts, that devotion to God's law and the strict discipline of faith do not matter one

¹ *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, pp. 1-2.

whit. They count for nothing. They are chosen at our own risk and upheld at our expense. But the genuine soul refuses to let the lines of good and evil be thus obliterated or confused, and he may have the moral satisfaction of feeling that this scrupulousness corresponds with the eternal estimate. God is alive to the distinction. On earth, if the pious man earns any notice, it is sometimes that of ridicule and contempt (ver. 1). In heaven, his methods and motives never fail to earn regard and sanction.

This belief that God will vindicate faith is the root of the whole psalter. He justifies faith; that is the oversong of the book. In an age like that of the psalmist, when religious principles were in danger of being blurred, and laxity either condoned or frankly justified as equally valid with strict faith, when faith was apt to burn down and the futility of conscience seemed almost a credible hypothesis, the heart had to swing back to the prophetic conviction that it is not all one to God, and that it will not be all one to men, whether they are reverent and honest and conscientious, or perfunctory in worship and unscrupulous in conduct. "Piety," Wellhausen points out, "cannot maintain itself if God makes no difference between the godly and the wicked, and has nothing more to say to the one than to the other; for piety is not content to stretch out its hands to the empty air, it must meet an arm descending from heaven. It must have a reward, not for the sake of the reward, but to be sure of its own reality, in order to know that there is a communion of God with men, and a road which leads to it." That is to say, moral principle and faith in providence react upon each other, in the religious sphere. Man's delight in the law of God corresponds to God's delight in the allegiance of His servants.

* * * * *

Isaiah xxxvii. 31 :—*The remnant that is escaped of the*

house of Judah shall again take root downward, and bear fruit upward. Depth of character needed in order to produce a really fruitful life. Unless the roots of the soul are struck deep into prayer and conviction, the outward conduct will never flourish. The visible graces depend upon previous attention to the inner principles of mind and character. Milton's lady in *Comus*, the Countess of Carbery, resists the seduction of the tempter and displays the finer graces of human nature. But, as Lowell notes in his essay on Pope, the explanation of this heroine's success is given by Jeremy Taylor, in his prose notice of the Countess. "The religion of this excellent lady . . . took root downward in humility, and brought forth fruit upward in the substantial graces of a Christian, in charity and justice, in chastity and modesty, in fair friendships and sweetness of society."

JAMES MOFFATT.

THE HEAVENLY TEMPLE AND THE HEAVENLY ALTAR.

I.

It is an old question whether the temple and the altar which were seen by Isaiah in his vision (Isa. vi. 1, 6) were in heaven or on earth. A century ago the question was differently answered by different interpreters; and it continues to be answered differently still, in spite of some forcible attempts on the part of scholars in recent times to settle it by reference to considerations that were beyond the range of the earlier scholarship. Duhm, for example, writes in his commentary: "The view that it is not the earthly but the heavenly temple that is meant needs no refutation, for the chapter is not of post-exilic origin; and so far as Isaiah is concerned it is not even certain that he thought of Yahweh as dwelling in heaven at all." A. Jeremias, in his *Babylonisches im Neuen Testament* (p. 65) with equal assurance asserts the contrary: "There is no doubt that the vision of Isaiah contemplates a heavenly temple with an altar of incense." Thus Duhm rules out the possibility of Isaiah speaking of a heavenly temple on the ground that the belief in such a temple belongs exclusively to the post-exilic period; whereas Jeremias argues, indirectly indeed with reference to this particular point, but clearly enough if I understand his general argument aright, that the belief in a heavenly temple was of ancient Babylonian origin, that what was believed in Babylon was

believed in Judah because the ancient world was dominated by the single coherent theory that all that existed and all that occurred on earth corresponded to what existed and occurred in heaven, and that, therefore, Isaiah believed in a heavenly temple and spoke of it in the passage in question. The reasoning is obviously unsound even if the premisses be correct. The conclusion may be correct, but is not necessary.

I will refer at present to one point only in connexion with this argument. It is less obvious than some, but of considerable importance. There is probably sufficient evidence to justify the assertion that the doctrine of correspondence between things earthly and heavenly is of great antiquity. But though the doctrine is ancient it does not necessarily follow that all that was implicit in it was explicitly apprehended at any particular period, or played any part in the thought and imagination of any particular age. Even granting that an *implicitum* of the doctrine of correspondence between things earthly and heavenly was the belief that a temple and an altar existed in heaven, yet the question still arises, at what time did this *implicitum* become explicit? When did people draw the particular conclusion from the universal formula and begin to think and speak of a temple in heaven?

This then is the wider question to which the disputed interpretation of a particular passage leads. We have to ask when, and where, and how the idea of a heavenly temple arose; what was the history of that idea, and how it was related to kindred ideas; and throughout we must be careful to distinguish between ideas which, though they may be related, are nevertheless distinct.

I propose to start my examination at a point at which the Jewish belief in a heavenly temple and a heavenly altar had become clear and precise, and then to notice

briefly some elaborations of the belief which first appear in literature of a later date. I shall next consider the evidence that has been adduced to prove the existence of this or similar or kindred beliefs in Babylonian literature, and for the Jewish parallels to these beliefs. Finally, I will return to the consideration of Isaiah vi., which, if valid, is an exceedingly important piece of evidence for the history of the belief in a heavenly temple. I shall conclude with a summary of what the evidence permits us to say with regard to the history and relation of the several ideas that will have been discussed.

In the Testament of Levi, written, if we may accept Dr. Charles's arguments, about 107 B.C., Levi relates (v. 1) that "The angel opened to me the gates of heaven, and I saw the holy temple ; and upon a throne of glory the Most High." With Dr. Charles, I believe this to be the oldest *unambiguous* reference in Jewish literature to a temple in heaven. The Testaments do not refer quite explicitly to an altar in heaven, though it would be a fair inference from two of the three forms of the text given by Dr. Charles in his translation of the third chapter that the author believed in the existence of such an altar. I will return later to this point.

The earliest work in which both altar and temple are explicitly and unambiguously mentioned is the Apocalypse of John, and in this work both are prominent. Moreover the allusions are such as to show that the heavenly temple (almost) exactly resembled the earthly Jewish sanctuary. "The temple (*ναός*) of God that is in heaven" contains "the ark of His covenant" (xi. 19 ; cf. xv. 5), the heavenly counterpart of the ark which had disappeared from the earthly sanctuary before the time of Jeremiah (Jer. iii. 16) ; and also the golden altar (viii. 3 ; ix. 13 ; cf. v. 8), a piece of temple furniture which appears to have been of late origin

and is mentioned first in the later strata of the Priestly Code. This fact was, of course, not known to the author of the Apocalypse, but it is of some importance as showing a development in the conception of the heavenly temple if that conception can be thrown back to an early period. It is also worth observing that the presence of the ark in the heavenly temple shows that the heavenly temple resembles the earthly temple, not as it actually was when John knew it, but as it was described in the sacred literature with which he was familiar.

The altar of burnt-offering which stood in the forecourt of the temple at Jerusalem facing its entrance also has its fellow in the heaven of John's vision. For this, and not the golden altar, is that from under which was heard the cry of "the souls of them that had been slain for the word of God" (vi. 9 f.; cf. xvi. 7). Whether the altar mentioned in xiv. 18 is the golden altar within or the altar without the heavenly temple, is disputed, and need not be determined here, for the belief in the two altars in heaven is established apart from this passage.

The service of the heavenly temple is performed by angels. "Another angel," we read, "came and stood over the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense that he should add it unto the prayers of all the saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne. And the smoke of the incense, with the prayers of the saints, went up before God out of the angel's hand" (viii. 3 f.). But the temple service is not confined to angels; they also "who came out of great tribulation . . . serve God day and night in His temple" (vii. 14 f.). The term "priest" is not applied in the Apocalypse of John to those that serve the heavenly temple, though it was so applied by others, probably in his own generation, and certainly later.

Within the heavenly temple is a throne (xvi. 17); this may be the heavenly analogue to the cherubim of the earthly sanctuary on which Yahweh was said to sit (enthroned),¹ or this particular detail may have another explanation which I will suggest later.

The heavenly temple, the heavenly altar, the heavenly priesthood in the passages to which I have thus far referred would appear, so far at least as nothing to the contrary is suggested, to be permanent institutions. Nor is the permanence of these institutions questioned (at least not directly) when the author towards the close of the Apocalypse writes: "There was showed me the holy city Jerusalem coming down out of heaven, having the glory of God . . . and I saw no temple therein: for the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple thereof . . . and the throne of God and of the Lamb shall be therein, and His servants shall do Him service" (xxi. 10, 22, xxii. 3). This holy city, the New Jerusalem which contains no temple, is at present in heaven, but is not, of course, co-extensive with heaven; the heavenly temple stands somewhere in heaven outside the New Jerusalem, and will continue to stand in heaven when the vision is realized and the New Jerusalem descends from heaven to earth.

Before passing away from the Apocalypse I make two remarks: (1) Even if we could find no indisputable references earlier to the heavenly temple, altar and priesthood, we should be compelled to assume for the origin of these ideas a date earlier than that of the Apocalypse, for the ideas there appear not as new creations needing explanation, but as current and familiar; and (2) in spite of the evident familiarity of the idea of the heavenly temple, the author takes very considerable pains to distinguish it from the earthly temple. Not only is the scene placed in heaven,

¹ Cp., e.g., 1 Samuel iv. 4; Numbers vii. 89 (Ex. xxv. 18-22).

but the temple is more than once particularly described as the "temple that is in heaven."

Nowhere else within the New Testament do these ideas come into the same prominence ; indeed it may be questioned whether other New Testament writers adopted or wished to perpetuate the belief that a temple and an altar served by an angelic priesthood existed in heaven. Nevertheless we may with certainty, or with greater or less probability, trace the influence of these ideas in several places, and more particularly in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where the form of the discussion has not improbably been affected by them. Yet when this writer speaks of the "holy place" into which Christ entered (ix. 12), he does not mean part of a temple in heaven, but, as he elsewhere says distinctly enough, heaven itself (ix. 24).¹ We may in particular question whether he adopted as his own the belief in the permanence of a heavenly altar. What is prominent in Hebrews is the thought of a high priest in heaven (e.g. viii. 1, x. 21); but this high priest is a priest who neither offers nor ever has offered a sacrifice on any heavenly altar, but has made once for all one supreme offering *on earth* (x. 5-18). The nature of the allusions not improbably indicates the familiarity of the author with a belief held by others in an altar in heaven served by a heavenly priesthood, but excludes the possibility that he himself adopted the belief.²

I shall not attempt to reproduce here to any considerable

¹ Heb. ix. 12, *εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ εἰς τὰ ἁγία* ; ix. 24, *οὐ γὰρ εἰς χειροποίητα εἰσῆλθεν ἁγία Χριστός, ἀντίτυπα τῶν ἀληθινῶν, ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν*.

² It lies beyond my purpose to discuss all the possible traces of these ideas in the New Testament, whether in Hebrews (see, e.g., viii. 5 ; cf. Acts vii. 44, dependent on Ex. xxv. 40 which I discuss later), or elsewhere (e.g. 2 Cor. v. 1 [cf. 1 Cor. iii. 16 f., vi. 19], vi. 16 ; Eph. ii. 21). If I am right in detecting the influence of the belief in a heavenly temple, though not the adoption of it, in any or all of these passages, they strengthen my argument that the origin of the belief lies well before the Apocalypse of John ; if not, that work by itself gives us the close of the first century A.D. as a minimum date for the existence of the belief.

extent the later Jewish accounts which were gathered long ago by Schöttgen and have been often cited since.¹ The new features which these later accounts present are relatively unimportant; and the references in later Jewish literature to the heavenly temple and the heavenly altar are chiefly of interest as indicating the range and persistence of the general idea. Two points come out a little more clearly than in the Apocalypse: (1) the term priests is given to those that serve the heavenly altar; and (2) the souls of the righteous are more clearly described as the offerings presented on the heavenly altar. The subject in itself, or in relation to others, raised questions for the curious, and some of these are answered in traditions that have been handed down. In some cases, too, we perhaps find a confusion of originally distinct ideas. The Babylonian Talmud (*Hagiga*, 12b) contains a tradition attributed to R. Meir (c. 160 A.D.) explaining in which of the seven heavens the heavenly altar stood: "In Zebul (i.e. the fourth heaven) is Jerusalem and the house of the sanctuary, and an altar built, and Michael the great prince stands, and offers offerings upon it." It is not surprising that traditions varied on a matter of this kind, and that in a *Midrash* of the eleventh century we read that "There in Araboth (the highest heaven) stands the great prince Michael, and on the altar before him offers the souls of the righteous."² Such a question as the relative size of the heavenly and earthly temples was raised, and Simeon ben Yokhai (second century, A.D.), according to the *Midrash Rabba*, asserted that "the sanctuary which is above is only 18 *mīl* higher than the sanctuary which is below." As the *mīl* is said to have been 2,000 stadia, the difference is considerable.

¹ In *Horæ Hebraicæ* (Dissertatio v.). Among recent discussions I may refer especially to Lueken's in *Michael*, pp. 30-32, 91-100.

² Cited by Lueken (p. 31) from Jellinek, *Bet ha-Midrash*, iii. 137.

In this later literature we also find ideas that have been confused with, but should be distinguished from, that of the permanent heavenly temple. Of these it will be necessary to refer to what is commonly described as the Jewish belief in the pre-existence of the temple and certain other things. This may take the form of a belief in the pre-existence of the actual earthly temple, or in the pre-existence of the temple in the New Jerusalem. Again, the pre-existence may be regarded as pre-existence in thought or idea, or pre-existence in reality. Probably the earlier form is the belief in the pre-existence of the idea of the temple, the belief in the pre-existing reality being a later materialization either in thought or expression.

I will illustrate this belief by a full quotation from the *B'reshith Rabba* (on Gen. i. 1), omitting the proof texts which are immaterial to our discussion. The first part of the passage has been often quoted or referred to; the story with which it closes, and which appears to me particularly instructive, less frequently.

"Six things preceded the creation of the world. Thus prior to the creation of the world was the actual creation of some of these things, viz., the law and the throne of glory, and the thought of creating the rest, viz., the Patriarchs, Israel, the Temple and the name of the Messiah, and, according to R. Ahabah, repentance. Rab Huna and R. Jeremiah, on the authority of R. Samuel, said: 'The thought of Israel was prior to everything else';¹ and what is meant by this may be illustrated by the case of a king who was married to a matron but had no son by her. One day the king was passing through the market, and he said, 'Take this ink

¹ ששה דברים קדמו לבריית העולם יש מהן שנבראן ויש מהן שעלו במחשבת להבראות חתורה והכסא כבוד נבראו האבות וישראל ובית המקדש ושמו של משיח עלו במחשבה להבראות רבי אהבה ברבי זעירא אמר אף התשובה... רבי הונא ורבי ירמיה בשם רבי שמואל בר ר' יצחק אמרו מחשבתן של ישראל קדמה לכל דבר.

and pen to my son.' Then every one said, 'He has no son, and yet he says, Take this ink and pen to my son.' They reflected and said, 'The king is a great astrologer; did he not foresee that he was about to have a son by her, he would not have said, 'Take this ink and pen to my son.' So had not the Holy One, blessed be He, foreseen that after twenty-six generations Israel would receive the law, He would not have said in the Law, 'Command the children of Israel.' "

The argument is clear, though by parity of reasoning it would seem to follow that everything mentioned in the law existed in the mind of God before the law itself was actually created. But the Rabbis, who often draw long and precarious chains of reasoning, were at other times content not to see beyond their noses.

In another Midrash all that is said to have preceded the creation of the world is explained to have pre-existed thus only in the mind of God.¹ Such an existence of the temple in the thought of God is obviously something very different from the heavenly temple of John's Apocalypse.

The pre-existence in heaven of the New Jerusalem prior to its descent to earth was, no doubt, an existence in reality. This is clear at least in certain cases; as, for example, in an interpolated passage of the Apocalypse of Baruch (iv. 2-6): "Dost thou think that this is that city of which I said, 'On the palms of my hands have I graven thee'? It is not this building which is now built in your midst; it is that which will be revealed with Me, that which was prepared beforehand here from the time when I took counsel to make Paradise, and showed it to Adam before he sinned, but when he transgressed the commandment, it was removed from him, as also Paradise.

¹ See Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, p. 129, where references will also be found to variant enumerations of the things that existed before the world.

And after these things I showed it to my servant Abraham by night among the portions of the victims. And again also I showed it to Moses on Mount Sinai when I showed to him the likeness of the tabernacle and all its vessels. And now, behold, it is preserved with Me as also Paradise. Go, therefore, and do as I command thee." (Charles's translation.)

Whether this passage definitely attributes a temple (or tabernacle) to the Jerusalem kept in heaven ready to descend to earth, and thus differs from the Apocalypse of John, I am not sure ; but for the most part the allusions¹ to the New Jerusalem do not specifically refer to temple and altar, and we need not pursue the subject further now. I will only add that Dalman (*Words of Jesus*, 130 f.) seems to me right in insisting that there is a distinction, and an important distinction, between the Jerusalem "that is above" and the Jerusalem that is to come down from heaven. The Jerusalem "that is above," like the heavenly temple and the heavenly altar, was a permanent institution, distinct from the Jerusalem that was to descend while that still tarried in heaven, and still to remain in heaven when the other had taken up its place below.

I now pass to consider the Babylonian conceptions which are parallel, or may be related, to the Jewish conceptions just described. And a quotation from Dr. Jeremias's *Babylonisches im Neuen Testament* will make a convenient transition. The fourth chapter of this book is entitled, "The Earthly Sanctuaries (*Heiligtümer*), copies (*Abbilder*) of the Heavenly Sanctuaries," and begins (p. 62) as follows : "The conception of a 'pre-established Harmony' constitutes the fundamental element in the ancient oriental view of the world. All earthly things and all earthly events are patterned forth in heavenly models. When in the Etana myth

¹ See e.g. Test. Dan. 5 ; 4 Esdras vii. 26, xiii. 36, viii. 52, x. 44-59.

Ishtar and Bel look about in heaven and on earth for a king, the insignia—sceptre, band, cap and staff—lie ready in heaven before Anu, the highest God. The priest-prince Gudea of Lagash receives in a vision on a tablet of lapis lazuli the building plan of the temple which he is to build for Ningirsu the messenger of the divine king, Anu. The most important document for this Babylonian doctrine occurs in a narrative of creation . . . Out of the primeval water the heavenly world with its three kingdoms is first created and then the earth. On the earth the sanctuaries of the three highest gods are created according to the pattern of the cosmic sanctuaries. Similarly in the Codex Hammurabi it is said that the Temple of Sippar was built in conformity with the heavenly Temple. And in an inscription of Sennacherib it is related that the plan of Nineveh was once drawn in conformity with the heavenly writing" (itti šitirti šamê).

If this account be correct, we have to do with two Babylonian ideas, which, though they may be related to one another, are certainly different and must in the interests of clearness be sharply distinguished. There is first the idea of sanctuaries (*Heiligtümer*) or temples (*Tempel*) in heaven; and second, the idea that some temples on earth are built according to a building plan supplied from heaven. The second of these ideas will bring us back shortly to Jewish ideas which we have not yet examined; as to its existence among the Babylonians there can be no doubt. On the other hand it will be necessary to examine rather closely the evidence adduced by Dr. Jeremias for the first idea, for it is by no means clear that the Babylonians anticipated the Jews in the belief that a temple (or temples) existed in heaven.

Of the two pieces of evidence adduced by Dr. Jeremias in the foregoing summary for a Babylonian belief in a

heavenly temple, that which is based on Hammurabi's reference to the temple at Sippar falls to the ground as soon as we pass from the loose German or English equivalent "temple" to the Babylonian term itself. Literally translated, the passage in question (in which Hammurabi is speaking of himself) reads: "Founder of Sippar, he who has clothed with verdure the sanctuary of A-a, architect of E-BABBAR (i.e. the temple of the sun in Sippar) which is like the dwelling of heaven" (mu-ši-ir bit E-BABBAR ša ki šu-ba-at ša-ma-i).¹ The crucial word *šu-ba-at*, which is loosely rendered by Jeremias in the passage quoted above "Tempel," is translated "trône" by Father Scheil and is, I suppose, as little specific as the cognate Hebrew *moshab*. The most that follows from the reference is that the Babylonians about 2000 B.C. thought of heaven not merely as the place where the gods dwelt, but as containing a building or house or throne of the gods.² But whether they pictured this heavenly building as resembling an earthly *temple* or as resembling an earthly *palace*, the term *šubtu* is not sufficiently precise to determine. From this passage it would obviously be illegitimate to argue that there was a Babylonian belief similar to the belief in a heavenly temple and a heavenly altar such as is found in the Apocalypse of John.

The second piece of evidence adduced by Jeremias for Babylonian belief in heavenly temples is a narrative of

¹ Col. 2, ll. 24-31. (The reference wrongly given by Jeremias in *Babylonisches im Neuen Testament* is correctly given in his *Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients* (ed. 2), p. 52.

² It is doubtful whether the words of Hammurabi *necessarily* mean even as much as is suggested above. May not *šu-ba-at ša-ma-i* be a case of the appositional genitive, so that the phrase means not the "dwelling in heaven" but "the dwelling-place which is heaven"? In that case the temple is said to resemble not a building in heaven, but heaven itself, as later in the code the foundations of E-SAGGIL are compared to those of heaven and earth (xxiv. 67 f.). For the belief that the temples resembled heaven there is analogy, as we shall see below.

creation preserved in a Neo-Babylonian copy, but itself presumably of far earlier origin. As everything in this case turns on interpretation, I shall give Mr. King's translation¹ of the narrative in full and then briefly indicate the chief differences of interpretation so far as they affect the present subject.

- The holy house, the house of the gods, in the holy place had not yet been made ;
 No seed had sprung up, no tree had been created.
 No brick had been laid, no building had been set up ;
 No house had been erected, no city had been built ;
 5. No city had been made, no creature had been created.
 Nippur had not been made, E-kur² had not been built ;
 Erech had not been created, E-ana³ had not been built ;
 The Deep had not been created, Eridu⁴ had not been built ;
 Of the holy house, the house of the gods, the habitation had not been made.
 10. All lands were sea.
 At that time there was a movement in the sea ;
 Then was Eridu made, and E-sagil was built,
 E-sagil, where in the midst of the Deep the god Lugal-dul-azaga dwelleth ;
 The city of Babylon was built, and E-sagil was finished.⁵
 15. The gods the Anunnaki he created at one time ;
 The holy city, the dwelling of their heart's desire, they proclaimed supreme.
 Marduk laid a reed upon the face of the waters,
 He formed dust and poured it out beside the reed.
 That he might cause the gods to dwell in the habitation of their heart's desire,

¹ Both text and translation will be found in *The Seven Tablets of Creation* (1902), i. 130 ff. Another English translation with commentary is given by Jastrow in *Babylonian and Assyrian Religion*, pp. 444 ff. Jeremias gives a German translation in *Das AT im Lichte des alten Orient* (ed. 2), pp. 129 f. ; and Jensen, in *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, vi. 39 ff. In details these translations differ frequently ; but the differences need not be noted here since they are not material to the discussion.

² Bel's temple at Nippur.

³ Ishtar's temple at Erech.

⁴ City sacred to Ea at the mouth of the Persian Gulf.

⁵ This line is considered by many, including Jastrow and Jeremias, to be a late addition to the original narrative.

20. He formed mankind.
 The goddess Aruru together with him created the seed of mankind.
 The beasts of the field and living creatures in the field he formed.
 He created the Tigris and the Euphrates, and he set them in their place ;
 Their names he declared in goodly fashion.
25. The grass, the rush of the marsh, the reed, and the forest he created.
 The green herb of the field he created.
 The lands, the marshes and the swamps ;
 The wild cow and her young, the wild calf ; the ewe and her young, the lamb of the fold ;
 Plantations and forests ;
30. The he-goat and the mountain goat . . . him.
 The lord Marduk laid in a dam by the side of the sea.
 [He . . .] a swamp, he made a marsh,
 [. . .] he brought into existence.
 [Reeds he form]ed, trees he created.
35. [. . .] he made in their place.
 Bricks he laid, buildings he set up ;
 [Houses he made], cities he built ;
 [Cities he made] creatures he created.
 [Nippur he made], E-kur he built.
40. [Erech he made, E-an]a he built.

In order to bring out the difference of interpretation which is of importance for our subject, the narrative may be briefly analysed thus :—In the first ten lines chaos is described ; there was nothing but sea ; among things that were then non-existent some are specified, including the cities of Nippur, Erech and Eridu, seats of the worship of Bel, Ishtar and Ea respectively. Then the process of creation is described, the *order of description* being as follows : (1) Eridu and E-sagil (lines 12, 13) ; [(2) “ Babylon ” (line 14)] ; (3) the Anunnaki (line 15) ; (4) a structure of reed and dust on the face of the water (lines 17, 18) ; (5) mankind (lines 20, 21) ; (6) animals (line 22) ; (7) Tigris and Euphrates (lines 23, 24) ; (8) grass, forest, countries, etc.

(lines 25–27); (9) the wild cow and sheep (line 28); (10) plantations and forests (line 29); (11) the goat (line 30); (12) the dam beside the sea, swamp, marsh, trees (lines 31–35); (13) houses and cities, including Nippur and Erech.

Does this curious order of description correspond to what was believed to have been the actual order of creation? If so, why was Eridu created first of all, and Nippur and Erech last, though when speaking of the cities non-existent before creation Eridu stands last, Nippur and Erech first?

Three interpretations that have been offered by different Assyrian scholars may be mentioned:

1. Zimmern (*Die Keilinschriften u. das AT*, 630 n. ¹, 498) remarks that it is particularly worthy of notice that the cities of Ea and Marduk, viz., Eridu and Babylon, together with their temples, were created first of all before heaven and earth. In this he discerns a parallel to the Jewish conception, already mentioned in this article, of the pre-existence of the New Jerusalem.

2. Jastrow (*Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, 446 f.) explains thus: "Eridu at the head of the Persian gulf, which for the Babylonians was the beginning of the great "Okeanos" surrounding the world, is the first dry land to appear, and hence the oldest place in the world. . . . The rest of the narrative, so far as preserved, is concerned with Marduk, Eridu alone is beyond his jurisdiction. Everything else, vegetation, mankind, rivers, animals, and cities, including even Nippur and Erech, are Marduk's work." So previously, and somewhat similarly, Jensen in *Die Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, vi. 361.

3. Jeremias (*Das AT im Lichte des alten Orients*,² p. 131) considers that the Eridu of line 12 is not the earthly city of that name, but the *heavenly* water-region, that lines 15, 16 refer to the creation of the *heavenly* kingdom of Anu, and line 17 f. to the creation of the *heavenly* kingdom of Bel, that

in line 21 ff. the creation of animals and plants is proleptically narrated, and that the creation of the earth is *first* mentioned in lines 31 ff., and that the earthly Eridu was mentioned after Nippur and Erech (lines 39, 40) in a line now lost.

The assumption that a line at the end referring to Eridu has been lost would not be unreasonable if Jeremias is right in his conclusion that the earthly Eridu has not been previously mentioned. But a point which Jeremias's interpretation fails to explain is why Eridu alone of the heavenly cities or regions (if these really are intended) is mentioned by name, and why the heavenly Eridu is mentioned before the other (heavenly) regions, though when the earthly cities are named, Eridu is mentioned last—after Nippur and Erech. Other points might be urged against Jeremias's interpretation. If it is incorrect, the narrative contributes absolutely no evidence direct or indirect for the belief in permanent heavenly buildings of any kind; nor, if Jastrow's interpretation be correct, for the belief that temples now on earth had had a previous existence in heaven. But, doubtless, there are difficulties and uncertainties on any interpretation. We may, therefore, ask how much follows, if Jeremias's interpretation be the correct one. His own conclusion apparently is that as the earthly Nippur, Erech and Eridu contained temples, so also did the heavenly Nippur, Erech and Eridu. But does this follow? Or may it be that the heavenly E, or house, was pictured as a palace rather than as a temple?

Everything considered, it appears altogether precarious to adduce from the evidence offered that early Babylonian thought contemplated temples in heaven with altars, like the heavenly temple and altar of later Jewish thought.

But questionable as the existence of a Babylonian belief in a temple and altar in heaven may be, there can be no

doubt that the belief that some earthly temples were built in accordance with instructions from heaven existed.

The belief can be traced back to about 3000 B.C., for it clearly dominates the inscription of Gudea¹ to which Jeremias refers, difficult and uncertain as much of it still remains.

The inscription falls into three sections; in the first Gudea dreams a dream in which he is directed to construct a temple; in the second part Gudea makes preparations in accordance with the instruction received, purifying the town, gathering materials and making and laying the first brick; in the third part the building of the temple is related. In the dream which chiefly concerns us, Gudea sees a man great as heaven and earth ordering him to build him a house; a woman holding in her hand a stylus and the tablet of the lucky star of heaven, and a second man holding a tablet of lapis lazuli and drawing the plan of a temple. The goddess Nina explains to Gudea the meaning of the dream; the first man is her brother Ningirsu ordering Gudea to build his temple, the woman is her sister revealing to Gudea "the temple, its construction, its pure star"; the man is Nindub giving the plan of the temple. The goddess explains other details, and concludes with the words: "He (Ningirsu) will reveal to you the plan of his temple, the warrior whose decrees are great will bless you."

Throughout this narrative there is no suggestion, as there well might have been, that Gudea ever saw, as Levi in the Testaments and John in the Apocalypse, a temple in heaven. Nor is there any indication that such a temple was believed to exist.

I am not aware of any exact parallel to Gudea's narrative

¹ The inscription is that denominated Gudea Cylinder A. It has been edited by F. Thureau-Dangin with a French translation in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* (xvi.-xviii.) and with a German translation in the *Vorderasiatische Bibliothek*, i. pp. 88-123).

in Babylonian literature. But we find more than one statement that cities, temples, or particular parts of temples, were built to conform to "the heavenly writing." This, if a related, is a different idea, for it appears to be established that the heavenly writing (*šitir ša-ma-i* or *šitir burûme*) is a term for the stars and constellations; sometimes the phrase is used with the suggestion that these are the writing which those who read the heavens can decipher and act accordingly, but sometimes also without any such suggestion, as in the passages where it is said that a temple is made brilliant as the heavenly writing, i.e. resplendent like the stars.¹

There remains a third Babylonian idea to which brief reference must be made. The Babylonian temples were reproductions in small, or symbols, of the Kosmos. The lofty-staged tower or zikkurat is a reproduction or symbol of the world-mountain; one of the oldest temples of Assyria bore the name E-kharsagkurkura, "the mountain of all lands"; a conspicuous feature in the temple area was the great basin called *apsu*, i.e. the Deep, the domain of Ea: the Du-azagga, i.e. the "brilliant chamber," or papakhu situated at the eastern end of the temple of Marduk, symbolizes the place whence the sun rises in the morning. The names of the zikkurats at Erech and Borsippa were "the house of seven zones" and "the house of the seven divisions of heaven and earth."²

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

(*To be concluded.*)

¹ For illustrative passages and on the subject generally see Jensen, *Kosmologie*, pp. 6-8.

² The details in this paragraph are drawn from Jastrow, *The Religion of Babylon and Assyria*, 614 f., 653, 629.

ST. PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

(A STUDY OF 1 CORINTHIANS XV.)

ST. PAUL'S doctrine of the Resurrection lies behind his teaching in every Epistle. It governs his thought throughout, but the fullest presentation of it is given in the fifteenth chapter of First Corinthians. The reasoning is so difficult and so intricate, that it challenges the attention of every reader, and suggests all kinds of grave questions. Many commentaries have been written upon it, but it is not superfluous to attempt to restate it afresh. For, even though nothing novel can now be said, it is always worth while to examine a great argument of this kind from different points of view. And as every man must approach it from his own angle, no honest attempt to grapple with its difficulties can be quite without suggestiveness to others.

I.

In any profitable study of 1 Corinthians xv. we must realize, in the first place, what St. Paul's postulates are, and what it is that he wishes to prove. He does not attempt to prove here that Christ rose from the dead. That was not disputed by his correspondents. The fact of Christ's Resurrection is, in fact, the pivot of his argument. But he seeks to give an answer to sceptical persons who doubted of their own resurrection. Just as some people say now "Miracles do not happen," so some people said then "Dead persons do not live again" (v. 12). It is this universal negative of despair which he wishes to refute. His argument is not addressed to those who rejected the Revelation of Christ. It is addressed to members of the Corinthian Church (*ἐν ὑμῖν τινές*, v. 12), all of whom had received the Gospel which St. Paul had preached (*ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε*,

v. 1). Belief in a life to come may seem to us an essential part of the Christian Faith. But this article was not found in that brief profession of belief which St. Paul rehearses at the beginning of his argument (vv. 3-7), to remind his correspondents what is their common starting-point. "The Life Everlasting" was, indeed, believed in by many, both Jews and Greeks, and the great majority—we cannot doubt—of the early Christian converts accepted it as part of the teaching of Christ. But its necessary connexion with the faith in Christ Risen was not obvious until it was pointed out; and some of the new disciples at Corinth had not perceived it. It is to these persons St. Paul addresses himself, and he begins, as is natural, by a statement, in words that had already become stereotyped by repetition, of the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Jesus. For them, as for him, this was the foundation of the Gospel message.

We are not, then, to think of vv. 2-11 as an attempt to prove the Resurrection of Christ. That was not in question. Nor, accordingly, is it legitimate to regard the list of Christ's appearances after His Resurrection as comprising *all* the appearances of the Risen Lord known to St. Paul.¹ It is not in his mind to give an exhaustive list. It is even conceivable that he is here repeating a traditional summary of these wonderful occurrences,—a summary which may have been as familiar to his correspondents as the Apostles' Creed would be in our day to the members of a Church only a few years reclaimed from heathendom. One must begin somewhere, and St. Paul begins here.

¹ It is important to note this, for the plausibility of much of Dr. Schmiedel's argument in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (s.v. "Resurrection," col. 4057), rests upon his assumption that the Resurrection of Christ had been doubted at Corinth, and that St. Paul "presents every possible argument" in reply. This is to misunderstand the aim of 1 Corinthians xv.

II.

We enter upon the argument proper at *v.* 12. It is a fourfold argument of the kind described by logicians as *reductio ad absurdum*. "If this, which you lay down, is true, then an absurd consequence follows—a consequence which you would be the first to repudiate. Therefore your statement was not justified, and the proposition you laid down is false." The proposition in question here is "Dead men do not rise"; there is no Resurrection of the Dead (*ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν, v. 12*). St. Paul puts in four pleas against this, in *vv.* 13, 16, 29 and 32 respectively, each of which proceeds, "If dead men do not rise, then . . . something follows which you recognize as absurd." We must go through these separately, and be specially careful to distinguish the first of these pleas (in *v.* 13) from the second (in *v.* 16), for they are often confused by hasty readers.

I. *vv.* 13–15. If dead men do not rise, then Christ did not rise, for He was Man, and therefore comes under your universal negative. But if He did not rise, our preaching (*κήρυγμα*) and your faith (*πίστις*)—that which we preach and which you believed when you were converted (*οὕτως κηρύσσομεν καὶ οὕτως ἐπιστεύσατε, v. 11*)—are alike empty (*κενόν, κενή, v. 14*). The "witnesses of the Resurrection" are liars. The traditional summary of the Gospel which has been recited (*vv.* 2–8) is *void* of its kernel. But you accept this Statement of Belief, and therefore *totidem verbis* you recognize an exception to your arrogant universal negative. Christ rose, as you confess. Christ was Man. Therefore you cannot say generally "Dead men do not rise." You can build nothing upon this universal negative, for in fact it is not true.

It will be recognized (*a*) that the point of the argument rests in the acceptance of Christ's Resurrection by those

against whom St. Paul is arguing ; and (b) that this answer does no more than indicate the *possibility* of human resurrections. Christ appeared after death. Death, therefore, is not necessarily the end. There is another world beyond. Whether we shall ever reach it or not, at all events there is another sphere of existence beyond the grave. And the demonstration of this is the first and most obvious consequence of the Appearances of the Risen Christ. If the argument stopped short here, all that could be said would be that as Christ has shown by His Resurrection that death is not necessarily the end of life, there *may* be a sphere of activity for us beyond the grave, as there demonstrably was for Him. The universal negative of the sceptically minded may be set aside ; but by this train of thought we do not get further in affirmation than a "Great Perhaps."

II. The second plea begins like the first ; it bases itself on the same postulate ; but it is more profound, and more subtle.

If dead men do not rise, then Christ did not rise ; and if that be so, your faith is *vain*. St. Paul has already shown that it would be *empty* (*κενή*) ; he now shows that it would be *useless* (*μαραία*), and that in three ways. For, if Christ did not rise, (a) "ye are yet in your sins" (v. 17) ; (b) "Those who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished" (v. 18) ; (c) "If in this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all men most pitiable" (v. 19). The Corinthians whom Paul addressed would not accept any of these conclusions, and therefore the premiss from which they all proceed must be erroneous.

(a) *ἐστὲ ἐν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ὑμῶν* (v. 17). Part of the Creed which the Corinthians professed was that Christ "died for our sins" (v. 3). They accepted the efficacy of His Atonement, which implies the Resurrection as

well as the Passion. "He was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification," as Paul expresses it elsewhere (Rom. iv. 25). No Corinthian convert would have allowed that he was "yet in his sins"; by denying a future life in general terms he did not mean to deny the justifying virtue in regard to sin of Christ's Death. Yet this denial would follow as a necessary consequence "if Christ be not raised," and if His Death, therefore, had been like that of other men.

(b) "Then they also who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished." If "dead men do not rise" be a universal maxim, it must apply to the dead in Christ as well as to others. But this would be entirely inconsistent with that great conception of Christ as the Second Adam, which he proceeds to expound (vv. 20-28).

"By man came death." It was a recognized tenet of later Jewish belief that death was the consequence of Adam's sin (cf. 2 Esdras iii. 21, iv. 30, vii. 48). But "by Man came also a Resurrection of the Dead." "As in the Adam all die, even so in the Christ shall all be quickened." In the history of the race, the Fall of Adam was a crisis where a new departure was made. So in the history of the race was the Resurrection of Christ a crisis where a new departure was made. The Fall of Adam was not a solitary and isolated act; it affected all his descendants; it was charged with consequences for all those who are "in Adam." So the Resurrection of Christ was not a solitary or isolated act; it is charged with consequences for all who are "in Christ."

Those to whom St. Paul writes admitted the Resurrection of Christ to have been a fact. He has argued above (I.) that this shows that at any rate one Man has survived the shock of death, and that therefore there is a world of life beyond the grave. But this argument does not *necessarily*

connect the Resurrection of the Christian with the Resurrection of Christ, for all that is true of Him is not true of us. He was conqueror of Death in His own case; but it might be asked, How does that give consolation to us, who are not as He was? And so we have here, II. (b), Paul's palmary argument for the future life of the Christian. Rightly understood, Christ's Resurrection carries ours with it. It was not, e.g., like the Vision or Reappearance of Moses and Elijah on the Mount of Transfiguration, which could prove nothing for other men except that two members of the race had in some way survived death. That would be consolatory, in a measure, but it would not be conclusive as to the fate of others. But Christ's Resurrection, if in one aspect—as already hinted in I.—it is *like* the Resurrection of all men, in another aspect it is utterly *unlike* all other Resurrections. Just as Adam's sin was in one aspect like any other man's sin, but in another aspect quite unique, in that it carried consequences such as cannot be ascribed to any other act of sin, so Christ's Resurrection was, in its deepest meaning and purpose, *unique*. It carried with it the victory over death of all who are "in Him." He is the ζωοποιός, the Giver of Life, to all who share in His Life. This is the Pauline reflection of the great pronouncement, "I am the Resurrection and the Life," which the Fourth Gospel records of Christ.

It should be observed, before we proceed with St. Paul's reasoning, that he does not here contemplate (vv. 20–23) the future lot of any except those who have fallen asleep *in Christ*. His argument is to show that the arrogant maxim "dead men do not rise" cannot be trusted, because, in the first place, Christ rose, and, in the second place, this Resurrection of His involves the Resurrection of those who share His life.

"In the Christ shall all be quickened" (v. 22). But

we are to observe that this "quickenings" is a gradual and orderly process. First came the Quickening of Christ Himself; the next stage shall be the Quickening of His living disciples at the time of His Second Coming (v. 23); and then (and not until then) shall be manifested the Quickening of the Dead in Christ (v. 24). The Final Consummation shall be this Conquest of Death, the Last Enemy. Then the words of the Psalm shall receive fulfilment, *He put all things in subjection under His feet* (Ps. viii. 6)—all things, except, to be sure, the Eternal Father Himself (v. 27), to whom even the Christ shall be, "subject" (v. 28). The verses 23–28 are, as it were, parenthetical, and explanatory of the time of the Quickening, which is the theme of the argument of vv. 20–23.

One significant word must be noticed here. The Risen Christ is described twice (vv. 20, 23) as the ἀπαρχή, the Firstfruits, of the future harvest. This word introduces a quite new thought, which is, however, only suggested and is not developed until vv. 36 ff. The thought is that of the Evolution of Humanity as a growth, like the growth of a seed which issues at last in leaf and blossom and fruit; the consummation of man's growth is the harvest of the seed implanted in him at the first. Of this harvest, the Risen Christ is the Firstfruits; the rest of the harvest will be reaped at His παρουσία (vv. 23, 24).

II. (a) and II. (b) have now been disposed of. We shall see that II. (c) is treated under IV.

III. v. 29. If dead men do not rise, what is the meaning of the ceremony of Baptism for the dead (ὕπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν)? Some of you observe this rite, and thus your own practice shows that you do not really believe in the utter extinction of life at death, which your sceptical negation implies.

Much has been written upon the nature of this Baptism for the Dead, but the evidence is not forth-

coming as yet which would enable us to speak with confidence about it. For our present purpose, it is not necessary to determine this obscure question. Whatever the practice was, it involved belief in a future beyond the grave, and therefore St. Paul's *reductio ad absurdum* provided a cogent and relevant argument. εἰ ὅλως νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται τί καὶ βαπτίζονται ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν;

(IV.) vv. 30-34. This is the completion of the argument suggested in II. (c) (v. 19). Its kernel is in v. 32. If dead men do not rise, why then "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," as the prophet represents the careless Jews saying (Isa. xxii. 13). If dead men do not rise—if there is no future, *carpe diem* is the best maxim for life; Epicureanism the true philosophy. But you do not accept this base conclusion; you recognize that there are higher interests than the bodily wants of the present hour, and thus you virtually give the lie to the assertion that there is no future, no resurrection of the dead. The philosophy of Hedonism is well described in the Book of Wisdom, where the foolish reasoners are represented as saying, "Come and let us enjoy the good things that now are; and let us use the creation with all our soul as youth's possession" (Wisd. ii. 6). But that is not our philosophy. Men do not neglect the pleasures and attractions of this present life unless they look for another. They are not content to endure hardness, unless some future gain is in store.¹ Those who "painfully serve the Most High . . . are in jeopardy every hour," as Esdras the prophet expresses it²; and St. Paul uses the same phrase to describe his

¹ Cf. Cicero: "Nemo umquam sine magna spe immortalitatis se pro patria offeret ad mortem" (*Tusc. Disp.* i. 15).

² The Greek is not extant, but the Latin version runs: "In eo tempore commoratae servierunt cum labore¹ altissimo et omni hora sustinuerunt periculum, uti perfecte custodirent legislatoris legem." (2. Esdr. vii. [89]). The parallelisms between St. Paul and the Apocalypse of Esdras are so

own strenuous life. "Why stand we in jeopardy every hour? . . . I die daily . . . I fought with beasts at Ephesus . . . but what advantageth it me if the dead rise not?" (vv. 30-32). One who lived such a life of pain and toil, without any hope of a future, would indeed be "of all men most wretched" (v. 19).¹ The sanctions supplied by the belief in a future are necessary, he argues, if men are to exercise self-control, self-denial, self-sacrifice. And none of those to whom he appealed would be willing to adopt in its integrity the cynical maxim of Hedonism, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die."

Of the four pleas which have now been examined, the first (vv. 12-18) rests upon the admitted fact that Christ was seen alive after His body had been consigned to the tomb. The information thus given about the spiritual world is comparable with, and in some respects similar to, the evidence which, it is alleged, is afforded by psychical manifestations in our own day. The Easter Epiphanies, if this were all, would be the most signal examples in history of post-mortem appearances or visions of the departed; but they would not be any more than this, except in so far as the circumstances of Christ's post-Resurrection intercourse with men point to His being not only a "spirit," but still in the "body." "A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye perceive me to have" (Luke xxiv. 39). But, apart from this, the mere fact that Christ was seen alive after death does not provide a revelation of the spiritual world differing in kind from any other vision of the departed, although the evidence for it be more cogent in degree than can as yet be produced by the Society for Psychical Research.

close as to suggest a direct literary connexion; but this is not the place to inquire which is the earlier writer.

¹ Cf. *Apocalypse of Baruch* (xxi. 13): "For if there were this life only, . . . nothing could be more bitter than this."

But when we proceed to St. Paul's second plea (*vv.* 16–29) we find that he introduces an entirely new conception of the Resurrection, which he now represents not so much as the *type*, but as the *guarantee* of our own. Here is the characteristic feature of Christian belief about the world beyond the grave; a future life is not only *possible* and *desirable*, but is *involved*, for Christians, in the Resurrection of Christ, who is Himself “the Resurrection and the Life.” The Risen Christ is not only the Firstfruits of the harvest of Humanity; He is the ζωοποιός, the Life-giver.

To this thought, then, as fundamental in his exposition, he returns at *v.* 35, after incidental mention of two arguments *ad hominem* against his sceptical correspondents, which are, perhaps, not of equal importance. Whatever was the nature of “baptism on behalf of the dead” we do not practise it; and in view of the strenuous and devoted lives of many serious men—Agnostic, Pantheist, Materialist—who have looked for no future reward, it is difficult to lay stress upon the apostle's argument in *vv.* 31–34, however fully we may recognize its practical effectiveness, not only in his age but in our own. And so we may resume the examination of his conception of Christ as the ζωοποιός, for this is the heart of his reasoning.

III.

In *vv.* 35, 36, he faces the inevitable question, “*How* are the dead raised? With what body shall they come?”¹ It is somewhat surprising that his answer should ever have been interpreted as suggesting the identity of the post-resurrection “body” with the corpse of the departed saint. The revivification of the body of flesh and the reincorporation of the material particles of which it is composed

¹ Cf. *Apocalypse of Baruch* (xlix. 2): “In what shape will those live who live in that day?”

did not, indeed, seem incredible in an unscientific age. The Baptismal Creed of the Church still professes belief in "the Resurrection of the *flesh*," a form of words which may be defended but which would certainly not be deliberately chosen now, were the Creed being compiled for the first time. The scientific difficulties of such a conception are obvious, and they were noted very soon after Christianity came into contact with Greek culture. For the body of flesh which is buried in the earth is resolved into its elements, and the ultimate particles of which it is composed are diffused again throughout nature in other forms. The process of corruption is a process of transformation into other living organisms. These, in their turn, die and in their turn are resolved into their elements; and so the process goes on, unceasingly. The particles—to use the popular phrase—which formed the body of Augustine or Dante or Luther have served many purposes and may have been incorporated in many human bodies during the centuries which have elapsed since those great men passed away. Who is to be their owner in the future world? To whose "body" shall they be assigned, for many owned them in the earthly life? Considerations such as these were pressed by pagan critics—by Celsus upon Origen, and by others upon Gregory of Nyssa; and once they were formulated, it was felt by the best intellect of the Church that they were unanswerable, and that the crude theory of a literal resurrection of the flesh was incredible.

To be sure, this theory, difficult as it is to accept when explicitly stated, has always had adherents; and to the present day it strengthens the opposition that is offered to cremation as a substitute for sepulture, as a means of disposing of the corpses of the Christian dead. For it is vaguely surmised by uneducated people that a body which is burnt is destroyed, while a body which is placed

in the kindly earth is preserved until the day of resurrection. There are other motives which operate, no doubt, one being due to the half-formulated conviction that it is less respectful to the body which in the lifetime of its departed owner was "the temple of the Holy Spirit," to burn it than to bury it. But whatever other causes may affect modern custom in the matter—and this is not the place to enlarge upon them—the most potent is that gross conception of a literal reinstatement and revivification of the flesh which Origen¹ and Gregory of Nyssa² found themselves obliged to repudiate.

It is not surprising, perhaps, that such a theory should have prevailed among uneducated people in a simple age; but it is remarkable that it should have claimed the authority of St. Paul's name. For, as we shall see, the discussion in 1 Corinthians xv. 35 ff. is inconsistent with the opinion that there is material identity between the earthly and the heavenly "bodies." The seed is not identical with the fruit. "That which thou sowest is *not* the body that shall be" (v. 37) is a sufficiently clear statement.

What does St. Paul intend to illustrate by the image of the sowing of the seed? This is a crucial question; for the prevalent misconceptions of his doctrine of the Resurrection of the body may, as it seems, be traced to a misinterpretation of this figure. Most commentators, both ancient³ and modern,⁴ have assumed that the apostle

¹ c. *Celsum*, γ. 18.

² Gregory's words are remarkable: ὑπόλοιπον σκοπεῖν εἰ ὥσπερ τὸ νῦν, καὶ τὸ ἐλπιδόμενον ἔσται—ὅπερ, εἰ ὁντως εἴη, φευκτὸν εἶπον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς ἀναστάσεως, εἰ γὰρ οἶα, ὅταν λήγεται τοῦ ζῆν τὰ ἀνθρώπινα σώματα, τοιαῦτα πάλιν ἀποκαθίστανται ἅρα τις ἀτέλεστος συμφορὰ διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως—τί γὰρ ἂν ἐλεεινότερον θέαμα ἢ ὅταν ἐν ἐσχάτῳ γῆρα καταρριγνυθέντα τὰ σώματα μεταποιηθῇ πρὸς τὸ εἰδεχθῆς τε καὶ ἀμορφον (*De anima et resurrectione*, col. 137, ed. Migne).


³ E.g. Chrysostom.

⁴ Three representative English commentators—Ellicott, Evans, Wordsworth—may be named as supporting the equation sowing=burial. I

means to illustrate the burial of a corpse by the figure of the sowing of a seed. Even Bengel takes this view. Of *σπείρεται* he says, "verbum amoenissimum *pro sepultura*." And the association of St. Paul's words with the sublime Office for the Burial of the Dead in the Church of England has done much to confirm this interpretation of his language. It may seem presumptuous to express doubts as to the value of an exegesis which can claim such varied authority. But, in fact, there is no single allusion to the act of sepulture from the beginning to the end of 1 Corinthians xv.; nor does St. Paul lay the slightest stress upon burial, or upon any other means of disposing of the corpses of the departed.

Let us look into the language he uses. His opening words, when scrutinized, will be seen to forbid any exegesis which equates *sowing* with *burial*. "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die" (v. 36). In the world of nature, that is, there are three stages in the transformation of a seed, viz. *Sowing, Dying, Quickening*; and they succeed each other in this order. The seed is sown *before* it dies, and it dies *before* it is quickened. Sowing *precedes* death in the operations of nature. But the burial of a corpse comes *after* death. There is no analogy between the sowing of a seed which *goes before* the death of the seed, and the burial of a human body which *comes after* the death of that body. We must then put out of our minds the idea that the burial of the dead is comparable to the sowing of the seed, if we are to comfort ourselves with the splendid words, "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." St. Paul's image is the same as that which is presented in the saying of Christ to

do not know, indeed, of *any* English commentary which explicitly repudiates this opinion; although Dr. Charles, in his *Eschatology*, has stated the more natural interpretation, as I have observed since this article was written.



the Greeks, "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it beareth fruit" (John xii. 24); but in neither passage has the image anything to do with sepulture or burial of the dead, and in both passages the central thought is the same, that the true life of the seed of human faculty can only be reached through death.

J. H. BERNARD.

(To be continued.)

HE THAT CAME BY WATER AND BLOOD.

THE idea from which the apostle starts in this passage (1 John v. 6-8) is that of the victory of faith. Who, he asks, is he that overcometh the world but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? So to believe makes us partakers in Jesus' own victory (John xvi. 33). In faith, however, the object is everything; if we are really to overcome, we must be very sure of Christ. To convey such an assurance is the apostle's aim in the passage. He seeks to show that Jesus is evinced or demonstrated to be the Son of God by the most conclusive tokens; and when he has summed up what may be called the external evidences by which we identify Him as what He is, he clinches them by adding, He that believeth hath the witness in himself.

It is from this point of view that we must read the opening sentence, This is He who came by water and blood, Jesus Christ (or perhaps Jesus the Christ). The past tense makes it quite clear that the reference is to the historical Jesus, and that the water and the blood allude to incidents and experiences of His life on earth in which His character as Son of God, the object of a world-subduing faith, is revealed. Looking to the Gospel and the Epistle of John as a whole, it can hardly be doubted what the incidents or experiences in question are. Jesus came

through water when He was baptized by John in Jordan. It is beside the mark to argue that John's baptism, which was one of water only, was no proof that Jesus was Son of God; it was submitted to or bestowed upon multitudes to whom it bore no such testimony. This is not the point of view of the apostle. "For this end," he represents the Baptist saying, "did I come baptizing with water, that He might be manifested to Israel" (John i. 31). It is quite true that ordinarily baptism with water is opposed by John to baptism with the Spirit; but in the case of Jesus they are not contrasted, they coincide. This is the proof, or an essential part of it, that Jesus is what Christian faith holds Him to be. "I knew Him not, but He that sent me to baptize in water, He said unto me: On whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending and abiding on Him, the same is He that baptizeth in the Holy Spirit. And I have seen and have borne witness that this is the Son of God" (John i. 33 f.). This is John's primary conception of the Son of God; the Son is the person who has the perpetual fulness of the Spirit and the perpetual power to bestow it, and Jesus is attested by the historical event and experience of His baptism—by His coming by water—to be this person.

From the same point of view it is apparent that the coming by blood must refer to the death of Jesus. He came by blood when He died upon the cross. Like His baptism, His death must be conceived as demonstrating Him in some way to be the Son of God. We know that this was one of the great difficulties of the first believers. To a superficial view the Cross was anything but an evidence that Jesus was what the apostolic Gospel declared Him to be. To Jews it was an offence, and to Greeks folly. We seem even in the New Testament to see Christian minds which felt its power groping uncertainly for the means of

explaining it. It is perhaps an instance of such groping when the evangelist, referring to the spear thrust into the side of Jesus, points out that the law regarding the paschal lamb—a bone of it shall not be broken—was thus fulfilled in Him, finding, to to speak, in Jesus the reality of which the ancient covenant sacrifice was only a symbol. But whatever intellectual embarrassments it may once have occasioned, the death of Christ is not a mere mystery to the writer of this Epistle. He tells us again and again of its meaning, and its power. “The Blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin” (i. 7). “He is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the whole world” (ii. 2). “Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that He loved us, and sent His Son to be the propitiation for our sins” (iv. 10). That the propitiation is made in the blood of Jesus can only be questioned by those who refuse to admit that the New Testament writers had any cohesion in their thoughts at all. It is in virtue of its propitiatory meaning and power that the death of Jesus is pointed to in the Epistle as proving Him to be the Son of God. No one will overcome the world if he faces it under the crushing weight of a bad conscience ; it is because Jesus, who died for sins, can lift this weight, that we recognize Him to be what the gospel declares. Because, to this wonderful intent of being a propitiation for the whole world, He came by blood, we say He is the Son of God. It is the work of atonement which reveals Him as what He is, and holds Him up as the object for a faith which has the world to overcome.

In this interpretation water and blood are taken literally ; the reference is to the historical events of the baptism and death of Jesus. But literal or historical is not synonymous with accidental, or spiritually insignificant and powerless. The water and the blood could not be thought of by John

except as implying and declaring the possession and communication of the Spirit by Jesus, and the expiation and conquest of sin. How the baptism and the death of Jesus, with the powers involved in them, are related to one another there is nothing here to explain. They were separated in time, but Jesus Himself spoke of His death as an awful baptism (Luke xii. 50; Mark x. 38 f.), and there is a passage in the Gospel (xix. 34) where John brings the water and the blood into the closest connexion with one another. "One of the soldiers with a spear pierced His side, and straightway there came out blood and water. And he that hath seen hath borne witness, and his witness is true, and he knoweth that he saith true, that ye also may believe." The extraordinary solemnity with which this is attested shows the importance it had for the evangelist, and it is impossible to agree with Godet that the passage in the Epistle has nothing whatever to do with the one in the Gospel. Surely it is clear that in Gospel and Epistle alike incidents and experiences in the history of Jesus are being emphasized which prove Him to be the true object of faith. And surely it is clear further that in Gospel and Epistle alike a protest is being made against those who not merely distinguished but separated the water and the blood, and claimed the benefit of the one while disowning any obligation to the other.

This is evident in the Epistle at all events. When John writes, "Not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood," he has unquestionably before his mind people who admitted that Jesus came with the first, but not with the second.¹ It is not legitimate, perhaps, to say that

¹ The difference between διὰ and ἐν in διὰ ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος and ἐν τῷ ὕδατι καὶ ἐν τῷ αἵματι is not to be pressed. The διὰ is more appropriate to the historical incident or experience through which Jesus *passed*, the ἐν to the spiritual virtue involved in it, in possession of which Jesus *abides* as the object of faith; but the two prepositions are used indistinguishably in a very similar connexion in Hebrews ix. 12, 14, 25.

these were people who accepted regeneration but rejected the atonement, who consented to receive from Christ a new life, but not to be in debt to Him for the expiation of sins. We may have grounds for believing that this attitude to Christ is not uncommon, and even for holding that of all causes which contribute to the misunderstanding of the New Testament the most profound and far-reaching is the failure to see that nothing but the atonement can regenerate ; but it is necessary to look to the writer's own age for more precise illustration of his meaning. He tells us himself in chap. iv. 1 ff. of false prophets, in whom the spirit of the Antichrist is at work, and who deny that Jesus Christ has come in flesh. The very early gloss in iv. 3—*omnis spiritus qui solvit Jesum*—points to teachers like Cerinthus, “the enemy of the truth” (Eus. *Hist. Ecc.* iii. 28. 6) as the truth was preached by John. Cerinthus, according to Irenæus (i. 26), held that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary, that after His baptism the Christ descended on Him in the form of a dove from the supreme God, that He then revealed the unknown Father and worked miracles, but that at the end the Christ departed from Jesus ; so that Jesus suffered and was raised, while the Christ as a spiritual being continued impassible. This seems to be precisely what the apostle is striking at—a Saviour, an object of faith, a Son of God, who comes by water only. Cerinthus (it might be put) saw divinity in the life of Jesus, but not in His death. He acknowledged the redemptive power of all that He did in virtue of His baptism, of all the teachings and healings which He accomplished in the power of the Spirit He received at the Jordan ; but it seemed to him incredible and unworthy that a Divine being should be dragged through the squalid tragedy of the Crucifixion. His Son of God did not come by blood : the passion of Jesus had nothing in it redemptive or

divine. Formally this belongs to the first century and is grotesque enough, but in reality, as has been suggested above, it is widely represented in our own world. There are many who are glad to acknowledge a general debt to the teaching and example of Jesus, but not a special debt to His death; many to whom regeneration, or moral stimulus, is as attractive as expiation is repellent, and who fail to see that in the Christian religion the two cannot be separated. The Person who makes propitiation in His blood is the same who baptizes with the Holy Spirit; it is because He does the one as well as the other—because He came not with the water only but with the water and with the blood—that we know Him to be what He is, the Christ, the Son of God, who has overcome the world and can enable us to overcome, the one adequate object of faith.

For a believer, it may be said, this is presumably convincing: but what of one who does not believe? What of the man who looks at the life of Jesus and at the death of Jesus as they are attested by the apostles—who contemplates Him as He came with the water and the blood—who tries to realize in some vague fashion what is meant by words like propitiation and regeneration—and who after all remains quite unmoved? It is perhaps in the sense of his own ineffectiveness and helplessness that the apostle, after emphasizing the water and the blood as realities which attest Jesus as the Redeemer, appeals directly to God. “And it is the Spirit that beareth witness, because the Spirit is the truth.” It is not enough that the facts should be there in indubitable historical reality, it is not enough that an apostle should be there to interpret and enforce them on the conscience in the full assurance of his own faith; if faith is to be born in sinful souls, even under these propitious circumstances, *God* must be there to bear the supreme testimony to His Son. There is this point of mystery in all true religion, the point

at which God and the soul meet. Not indeed that it is mere mystery : the Spirit does not work in the dark, but takes the things of Christ, the water and the blood, and makes them real, significant, present and powerful to the soul. Only the Spirit can do this. All the essential facts, all the presuppositions of faith, so to speak, may be present, yet faith itself is not born till the touch of God completes the spiritual circuit, and the heart is suddenly thrilled with the atoning and regenerating power of Him who came by water and blood. What was remote, inert and unintelligible flames up under the witness of the Spirit into the present, living, all-powerful love of the Redeemer.

In a sense the Spirit is the only witness : it belongs to it alone to make the past present, the historical eternal. We call the New Testament an inspired book because as we hearken to its testimony to Christ the past ceases to be past, and everything is transacted before our eyes, and in relation to ourselves. Time disappears, and Christ is with us in His Spirit which is the Truth. It is not our experience that He spoke these words, but that He speaks them ; not that He received sinners and ate with them, but that He receives sinners and spreads His table for them ; not that He prayed for His own, but that He makes intercession for us. We do not even say, He came by blood, but He is here, clothed in His crimson robe, in the power of His atonement, mighty to save. This is what the Spirit, which, properly speaking, is the supreme and sole witness, does for us in attesting, interpreting and applying the historical facts of the life of Jesus. But the apostle has also another way of looking at the matter. There are three, he says, who bear witness, the Spirit and the water and the blood ; and the three agree in one. At first the Spirit is a witness to the water and the blood, sealing their meaning and their power upon the soul ; but it is possible also to think of all three as

bearing one concordant testimony to the Son of God. How are we to understand this ?

It does not seem possible to explain it unless we admit at this point an allusion to the Christian sacraments. Sometimes this has been very strongly denied. Dr. Charles Watson, for example, in his profound and beautiful commentary on this Epistle, writes : " St. John neither in his Gospel nor in his Epistles takes any notice whatever of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. This fact makes it unlikely that he was thinking of them when he speaks of the water and the blood as witnesses to Christ." Even Bishop Westcott says no more than that we are led to the ideas which underlie the two sacraments. When we remember the time at which John wrote, and the place which Baptism and the Supper, as we see from almost every New Testament writer, soon came to hold in Christian worship, it seems fair to use much stronger language. It is to the writer quite incredible that any Christian reader should ever have heard John iii. without thinking of baptism, or John vi. without thinking of the Supper, or this passage without thinking of both. Baptism and the Supper are perpetually present in the Church, and they are a perpetual attestation of the water and the blood. They remind us unceasingly of those great events in the life of Jesus by which He is identified as the Son of God and Saviour of men—His Baptism in water, with which His Baptism with the Spirit coincided, so that it became the type of all Christian baptism, in which also the coincidence of water and spirit is conceived as normal ; and His death upon the Cross, in which He became a propitiation for the whole world. The sacraments are a standing testimony to these great facts and to their meaning and power. They guard the realities which are vital to the Christian religion. They speak ceaselessly of Christ as able in virtue of His life and death

to regenerate men and to atone for sins. In them, to put it strongly, we have the water and the blood always with us. We need not hesitate to say so because the words are capable of being abused. They are true when spoken at the moral temperature at which their meaning is realized ; they are not true as a theological doctrine, defined in cold blood. Very probably superstitious ideas had gathered round the truth even before John wrote, just as they had gathered round the sacraments at Corinth (see 1 Cor. x.), but it is as absurd to make John responsible for this in the one case as Paul in the other. The representatives of the religio-historical method, who interpret everything in *malam partem* and who are never so sure they are right as when they convict the apostles of religious materialism or primeval superstition, have lost their balance. In St. John's words about the sacraments in this passage there is a mingling of history, of symbolism, and of the spiritual experience of fellowship with the Son of God in the power of His life and death ; but it is only an unsympathetic, one is almost tempted to say an unchristian, reader, who can find any trace in them of the magical sacramentalism of the pagan mysteries. It is far more plausible to argue that in every place in his writings in which John touches on the sacraments he is careful to leave the primacy with the Spirit. Thus in the third chapter of the Gospel he speaks once of being born of water and spirit, because that is the Christian norm as illustrated by the baptism of Jesus, but afterwards omits the water, and says born of the Spirit only. In chapter six, after saying the strongest things about eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of man—which the writer believes to be sacramental language—he precludes misconception (or tries to do so) by adding, It is the Spirit that gives life ; the flesh profits nothing. And finally, in the Epistle, while the water and the blood, perpetuated in the sacraments,

are themselves witnesses to Christ, the supreme witness is that of the Spirit, apart from which neither the water and the blood as historical facts, nor their perpetuation in the sacraments, have any power at all. Taking his words, however, as they stand, their effect is not to disparage the sacraments but to magnify their work as witnesses to the great experiences of Jesus by which He is evinced to be the proper object of faith.

It is in this connexion also that we become conscious of the value of the passage for all time. The apostle's interest is not in the sacraments, but in the historical realities on which the life of Christianity depends, and he refers to the sacraments only because they guarantee these realities and keep them in evidence in the Church. History will always have its difficulties, and there will always be efforts made to free religion from any dependence upon it. The Spirit, or what is called the Spirit, will always be appealed to against the more or less uncertain facts. Even a religion like the Christian, which from the beginning rested on a narrative of historical events, is subjected to this treatment. The important thing in Christianity, men say to themselves, is its ethical principle; grasp this, and everything else is indifferent. Jesus may have been the first to apprehend it clearly, but in essence it is quite independent of Him; once we realize it in its purity and truth, we do not need to vex ourselves about the truth or falsehood of the Gospel story. Die to live, as He no doubt did, or had it as His principle to do; sacrifice the lower life for the sake of the higher, and what question remains to be asked? It is not the business of any one who pleads the cause of Christianity to condemn those who seek to live by a Christian rule; but if the apostle is any authority upon the subject, this substitution of abstract principles for the Passion of the Son of God is not Christianity at all. It is not the

reality of abstract principles, however true or sublime, on which his faith leans; it is the reality of blood. It is no poetic or philosophic *Stirb und werde*, nothing which can be learned from Goethe or Hegel, which makes us Christians; it is the pierced side, the thorn-crowned brow, the rent hands and feet of Jesus. Our faith is evoked by one who came by blood, and it rests on Him alone. What can a religion of ethical principles merely do to provide a propitiation? What can it offer to lost men? What are the ethical principles from which we can deduce that profound and grateful assurance of the forgiveness of sins which inspires the doxologies of the apostolic Church?

These considerations are of special importance at present when the historical criticism of Scripture is raising so many problems for faith, and when attempts are made to allay anxiety on lines which are substantially those here denounced by the apostle. Often we hear it said to perplexed souls, "There is really nothing to be anxious about. Faith and criticism move on different planes; they can never touch, and therefore can never come into collision. Criticism may come to any conclusion whatever about the truth of facts or what are alleged to be facts in the Bible, and it will make no difference to religion." It is difficult to understand how this is believed by those who say it, and it is certainly not believed by those who hear it. It never mitigated any Christian's anxiety, but it has often added exasperation to alarm. To a simple and earnest spirit it means too obviously that religion is only to have the kind of reality which belongs to ideas and principles, not the reality of blood; and with the change all the specifically Christian virtue has departed from it. To say that faith cannot be affected by any critical result is to say that religion is independent of any historical basis, and that is to teach the false spirituality which the apostle here rejects. The Chris-

tian religion, at all events as he knew it, lives and has its being in the historical. Instead of saying to men, "nothing historical matters," we ought] rather to say, "See how unimpeachable is the evidence by which the essential historical facts are guaranteed. Look, to go no further, at the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. They were celebrated universally in the Church before any part of the New Testament was written. They bear witness still to Him who came by water and by blood. Every one of the countless millions who since the day of Pentecost to this day has been baptized in the name of Jesus is a witness to the baptism of Jesus Himself. Every one who since the night on which He was betrayed has eaten the bread and drunk of the cup in the Lord's Supper is a witness to the reality of His passion." There are things which cannot be shaken, and it is absurd to speak as if they could be shaken and leave our religion untouched. It is because the Spirit of God has these historical realities to attest that there is such a thing as Christianity in the world. Without them preaching is vain and faith is vain; there is no love of God known to us on which we can lean as Christians have leaned hitherto on the Passion of their Lord.

The emphasis which the apostle lays on the blood, when he speaks of the coming of Jesus, should have something which reflects it in the life of the believer. Christianity should be as real as the Passion of the Saviour on which it rests. No deliberate aim at a sheltered life is Christian. It is possible to fall short here with the most amiable intentions. Often this is the result when the Christian life is lived in coteries, and the relations of believers are all to each other and none to the world. The sanctification of the soul then takes the place of the consecration of the life, and passion disappears. So few make holiness in any sense their chief end that it may seem rash to speak against this,

yet it is painfully true that even Christian faith becomes insipid and ineffective unless it confronts the world, comes with blood, and is proved in the actualities and conflicts of life. But coteries and conventions do not perhaps mislead so many as the charm and happiness of what is probably counted a Christian home. It is not uncommon to see life narrowed in such circumstances to the circle of the domestic affections. It is pure, beautiful, amiable, truly happy; but it has no interests beyond itself. The conflicts of the world rage around it but it is not troubled by them; all that calls for effort, sacrifice, blood, is ignored. The Lord's battle is going on against powerful forces of evil—pride, sensuality, secularism, false patriotism, drunkenness, greed—but the members of such families are not in it. Their life is refined, retired, accomplished perhaps, but bloodless. Is that Christian? Can One who came by blood see in lives like these of the travail of His soul? Or does not reality like that of His Passion call for something far more intensely and vividly real in those who believe in His name?

JAMES DENNEY.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

V.

CREDIBILITY *contd.*—"THE EASTER MESSAGE."

PROFESSOR HARNACK, in his lectures on Christianity, bids us hold by "the Easter faith" that "Jesus Christ has passed through death, that God has awakened Him to life and glory," but warns us against basing this faith on "the Easter message of the empty grave, and the appearances of Jesus to His disciples."¹ On what, then, one asks, is the faith to be based which connects it peculiarly

¹ *What is Christianity?* pp. 160-3.

with Easter ? Or on what did the apostles and the whole primitive Church base it, except on their conviction that, in St. Paul's words,¹ Jesus "was buried, and that He hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures ; and that He appeared to Cephas," and to the others named ? But in all these "stories told by Paul and the Evangelists," Professor Harnack reminds us, "there is no tradition of single events which is quite trustworthy."²

It is this assertion of the insecurity of the Easter message of the Resurrection as a basis for faith which is now to be tested. Attention will be given first to the points which are more central and essential. It is, of course, easy to spirit away every part of the evidence by sufficiently bold denials, and by constructions which betray their weakness in the fact that hardly two of them agree together. It will be seen as the inquiry proceeds that the contradictions imputed to the Evangelists are trifles compared with those of the critics among themselves in seeking to amend the history. Agreeing only in rejecting the evidence of the Gospels as to what actually happened, they lose themselves in a maze of contradictory conjectures.

A few examples may be of service.

Weizsäcker, like Pfleiderer, is certain that St. Paul knew nothing of the women's visit to the grave. "The only possible explanation," he says, "is that the Apostle was ignorant of its existence."³ "Paul," says Pfleiderer, "knows nothing of the women's discovery of the empty grave."⁴ Professor Lake, on the other hand, thinks that St. Paul *did* know of it, and accounts in this way for his mention of "the third day."⁵

Further, as "Paul's knowledge of these things must have come from the heads of the primitive Church,"

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 4-6.

² P. 162.

³ *Apost. Age*, E.T., i. p. 5.

⁴ *Christian Origins*, p. 134.

⁵ *Res. of Jesus Christ*, pp. 191-6.

Weizsäcker deduces that "it is the primitive Church itself that was ignorant of any such tradition."¹ The visit of the women must therefore be dismissed as baseless legend. Keim agrees.² But Renan,³ Réville, H. J. Holtzmann,⁴ O. Holtzmann, Professor Lake—indeed most—accept the fact as historical.

Another crucial point is the empty tomb. Strauss, Keim, and, more recently, A. Meyer⁵ treat the empty grave as an inference from belief in the Resurrection. But a "hundred voices," Keim acknowledges, are raised in protest, and "many critics, not only of the Right, but even of the Left, are able to regard it [the empty grave] as certain and incontrovertible."⁶ "There is no reason to doubt," says O. Holtzmann, "that the women did not carry out their intention of anointing, because they found the grave empty."⁷ Renan does not dream of questioning the fact.

Many critics, including Professor Lake,⁸ think it impossible that Jesus should have spoken of His death and Resurrection on the third day. Others, as A. Meyer⁹ and O. Holtzmann,¹⁰ find in such sayings of Jesus an important element in the development of belief in the Resurrection.

A favourite view, shared by Strauss, Weizsäcker, Keim, Pfleiderer, A. Meyer, Professor Lake, is that the disciples, immediately after the Crucifixion, fled to Galilee, there, and not at Jerusalem, receiving the visions which convinced them that the Lord had risen.¹¹ On this hypothesis, the

¹ *Ut supra*.

² *Jesus of Nazara*, E.T., vi. p. 296.

³ *Les Apôtres*, ch. i.

⁴ *Die Synoptiker*, p. 105.

⁵ *Die Auferstehung Christi*, pp. 120-25.

⁶ *Ut supra*, pp. 297-8.

⁷ *Leben Jesu*, p. 391.

⁸ *Ut supra*, pp. 255-259.

⁹ *Ut supra*, pp. 181-2.

¹⁰ *Ut supra*, p. 388.

¹¹ Weizsäcker, i. pp. 2, 3; Keim, vi. pp. 281 ff.; A. Meyer, pp. 121, 127-30, etc.

women, even if they visited the tomb, had no share in the origin of the belief in the Resurrection.¹ Most, on the other hand, who, like Renan² and H. J. Holtzmann,³ accept the visit to the tomb, hold that the Apostles were still in Jerusalem on the Easter morning.

To return to the positive investigation. It has already been seen that no doubt can rest on the cardinal fact that Jesus *did* die, and was buried; and Harnack will allow a connexion of the Easter Message with "that wonderful event in Joseph of Arimathæa's Garden," which, however, he says, "no eye saw."⁴ What was the nature of that connexion?

1. It is the uncontradicted testimony of all the witnesses that it *was* the *Easter morning*, or, as the Evangelists call it, "the first day of the week," or *third day* after the Crucifixion, on which the event known as the Resurrection happened; in other words, that Jesus rose from the dead *on the third day*. The four Evangelists, whatever their other divergences, are agreed about this.⁵ The Apostle Paul, who had conversed with the original witnesses only eight or nine years after the event,⁶ confirms the statement, and declares it to be the general belief of the Church.⁷ Not a ripple of dubiety can be shown to rest on the belief. "There is no doubt," Professor Lake allows, "that from the beginning the Resurrection was believed to have taken place on the third day."⁸

¹ A. Meyer, p. 124; Lake, p. 195.

² *Les Apôtres*, ch. i.

³ *Ut supra*, p. 105.

⁴ *Ut supra*, p. 161.

⁵ Matthew xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 2; Luke xxiv. 1; John xx. 1. The predictions of Jesus of His rising on the third day may be added, if only as evidence of the belief.

⁶ Galatians i. 18, 19, ii. 1, 9. Strauss says, "There is no occasion to doubt that the Apostle Paul had heard this from Peter, James, and others concerned." (*New Life of Jesus*, i. p. 400.)

⁷ 1 Corinthians xv. 3.

⁸ *Ut supra*, p. 253; cf. p. 264.

Here, then, it might seem, is an unchallengeable basis from which to start, for a whole Christian Church can hardly be conceived of as mistaken about an elementary fact connected with its own origin. But the fact is not unchallenged. Nothing in this history is. Strauss long ago set the example in endeavouring to show how the belief might have originated from Old Testament hints.¹ Professor Lake, who thinks it rests "on theological rather than historical grounds,"² devotes some twenty-five pages of his book, in different places, to weaken its foundations.³ The new Babylonian school derives it from pagan myths.⁴ A writer like A. Meyer combines all the standpoints, and would explain it from Old Testament passages, predictions of Jesus, and Greek, Persian, and Babylonian analogies.⁵

It is difficult to know what to make of a criticism of this kind, which so boldly sets aside existing evidence to launch out on assertions for which no proof can be given. It is the more difficult in Professor Lake's case, that in the end he accepts the Marcan tradition of the visit of the women to the tomb—or what they took to be the tomb—on the morning of the third day after the Crucifixion, for the purpose of anointing.⁶ If they did—and who can reasonably doubt it?—why all this pother in seeking an explanation from Old Testament suggestions, Babylonian mythology, and other obscure quarters? It is argued, to be sure, that even the experience of the women was not a proof that the Resurrection did not take place on the *second* day rather than on the *third*, and mythology is called in to help to fix the day.⁷ One reads even: "It is never stated, but only implied in Mark that the Resurrec-

¹ *Ut supra*, i. pp. 438-9.

² *Ut supra*, p. 264.

³ Cf. pp. 27-33, 191-3, 196-9, 253-65.

⁴ Cf. Cheyne, *Bible Problems*, pp. 110 ff.; Lake, pp. 197-8, 261.

⁵ *Ut supra*, pp. 178-85.

⁶ *Ut supra*, pp. 182, 196, 246, etc.

⁷ Pp. 254, 259-63.

tion was on the third day.”¹ As if, in St. Mark’s time, a single soul in the Church had a doubt on that subject!

The treatment of St. Paul’s testimony to “the third day” is not less arbitrary. The attempt is made by Professor Lake to separate St. Paul’s mention of the third day from his witness to the appearances; “the strongest evidence for the alternative [negative] view” being, that it requires that St. Paul should have said, “and was seen on the third day,” not “and was raised on the third day.”² One asks, Could Jesus have been seen until He was raised? It is granted that St. Paul was acquainted with the Jerusalem tradition which embraced this fact.³ Yet several pages discuss, with indecisive result, whether “the third day” was not “merely a deduction from Scripture.”⁴ The conclusion is that, whatever St. Paul’s reason (it is allowed later on that it is “not impossible” that his reference may be to the experience of the women),⁵ “we can only be almost certain that it cannot have been anything which he was able to rank as first-hand evidence of the Resurrection.”⁶ Is not the unreality of such reasoning itself a powerful corroboration of the historicity of the Gospel and Pauline statements.

2. The next important element in the witness, in part implied in the preceding, is *the visit of the women to the tomb of Jesus* at early morning on the third day.⁷ Here, again, with some variation, we have a substantial nucleus of agreement. The differences will be looked at immediately; but how little they touch the main matter is apparent from the circumstance that, even among the extremer sceptics, the greater number admit that the

¹ P. 198.

² Pp. 27–8.

³ P. 41.

⁴ Pp. 29–32.

⁵ P. 198.

⁶ P. 32.

⁷ Matthew xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 1, 2; Luke xxiv. 1, 10; cf. xxiii. 55; John xx. 1.

women—the same named in the Gospels—*did* go to visit the tomb of Jesus on that memorable morning. Strauss can hardly admit it, for he throws doubt on the previous fact of the burial. But most who allow that Jesus was laid in the (or *a*) rock-tomb admit that the sorrowing women who had followed Him from Galilee, and had witnessed the Crucifixion and entombment,¹ or members of their company, did, as was most natural, come to the tomb on the morning after the close of the Sabbath, as day was breaking, for the purpose of anointing the body. Professor Lake admits this; the two Holtzmanns admit it; even A. Meyer, although, without the least ground, he disconnects the incident from the third day, concedes that visits were made.² Renan gives a summary of the facts, yet with a touch of inconsistency with his previous statements which, in the Evangelists, would be called “contradiction.” He tells, e.g., of “the Galilean women who on the Friday evening had hastily embalmed the body,”³ forgetful that earlier he had correctly described the embalming as performed by Joseph and Nicodemus.⁴

The essential point being thus conceded, long time need not be spent on the alleged discrepancies with regard to (i) the *names and number* of the women. St. John’s account in this connexion will be considered by itself. Meanwhile what must strike every careful reader is, that the names of all, or most, of the women concerned are, if not directly in the narratives of the Resurrection, yet in the related accounts of the closing scenes, given by each of the Evangelists. It is St. Mark, the supposed source, that tells how, at the Crucifixion, “there were

¹ Cf. Matthew xxvii. 55, 56; Mark xv. 40, 41; Luke xxiii. 49; John xix. 25.

² *Ut supra*, p. 124. His account is referred to below.

³ *Les Apôtres*, p. 6.

⁴ *Vie de Jésus*, p. 431.

also women beholding from afar; among whom were both Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James the less, and of Joses, and Salome, who, when He was in Galilee, followed Him and ministered unto Him; and many other women which came up with Him to Jerusalem";¹ and how, at the burial, "Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where He was laid."² These two, with Salome, are then described as buying spices and coming to the tomb on the Resurrection morning.³ St. Matthew gives the like story of "many women beholding from afar, which had followed Jesus from Galilee," "among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee (Salome)," ⁴ and tells, as before, of Mary Magdalene and the other Mary "sitting over against the sepulchre."⁵ It is extravagant to suppose that because St. Matthew, following up this statement, speaks of "Mary Magdalene and the other Mary" ⁶ coming to the sepulchre on the first day of the week, and omits the mention of Salome, he designs to contradict St. Mark, who includes her.⁷ St. Luke, likewise, knows of "the women that followed with Him from Galilee," ⁸ and who (therefore not the two Maries only) beheld where He was laid,⁹ and came with their spices on the first-day morning.¹⁰ St. Luke gives the list afterwards as "Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and the other women with them." (Salome is omitted and Joanna the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, appears.)¹¹ St. John

¹ Mark xv. 40.² Ver. 47.³ Mark xvi. 1.⁴ Matt. xxvii. 55, 56.⁵ Ver. 61.⁶ Matthew xxviii. 10.⁷ It would be as reasonable to accuse St. Mark of contradiction because in one verse he speaks of "Mary the mother of James the less and of Joses," and in another of "Mary the mother of Joses" only.⁸ Luke xxiii. 49.⁹ Ver. 55.¹⁰ Luke xxiv. 1.¹¹ Ver. 10.

corroborates the others in speaking of Christ's "mother and His mother's sister [probably Salome, so Meyer, Alford, etc.], Mary the wife of Clopas and Mary Magdalene,"¹ at the Cross; but at the Resurrection he speaks only of Mary Magdalene,² of whom he has a special story to tell. The "we," however, in St. John xx. 2, implies the presence of others.

Is there really any difficulty of moment in these various narratives? They are incomplete, but surely they are not contradictory! The same group of women is in the background in each; Mary Magdalene and "the other Mary," are the prominent figures in all: the mention of other names is determined by the preference or special object of the Evangelist. It is most natural that the mourning women should repair at the earliest moment on the morning after the Sabbath to the tomb of their Crucified Master, to "see" it, as St. Matthew says,³ and, if access could be obtained, to complete the rites of burial. There is no need for supposing that they came together; it is much more probable that they came in different groups or companies—perhaps Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, or these, with Salome, first, to be joined after by Joanna and other members of the Galilean band.⁴ Nothing, as was before noted, can be inferred from St. Matthew omitting to mention the design of anointing. His story of the guard, as rendering the anointing impossible, may have influenced him: only that the women knew nothing of the guard. It is not that the Evangelist was ignorant

¹ John xix. 25.

² John xx. 1.

³ Matthew xxviii. 1.

⁴ After enumerating the women Renan says: "They came, probably each on her own account, for it is difficult to call in question the tradition of the three Synoptical Gospels, according to which several women came to the tomb: on the other hand, it is certain that in the two most authentic narratives [?] which we possess of the Resurrection, Mary Magdalene alone played a part." (*Les Apôtres*, p. 6.)

of the custom of anointing ;¹ but, following up the picture he had drawn of the two Maries "sitting over against" the sepulchre at the burial,² he gives prominence to the yearning of love these women felt to see again where the Lord slept.³

There remains (ii) the *time* of this visit of the women, as to which, again, discrepancy is frequently alleged. Certain of the notes of time in the Evangelists raise interesting exegetical questions (e.g., St. Matthew's "late on the Sabbath day" ;⁴ St. Mark's "when the sun was risen" ⁵); but real contradiction it is hard to discover. What can be readily observed is that no one of the Evangelists employs the precise expression of another—a strong proof of independence ;⁶ and further, that all the expressions imply that the visits took place at, or about, early dawn, or daybreak, when darkness was passing into day. St. Matthew gives the description, "late on the Sabbath" (ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων), as it began to dawn (τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ) towards the first day of the week.⁷ St. Mark says : "Very early (λίαν πρῶί) on the first day of the week . . . when the sun was risen (ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου).⁸ St. Luke has the expression : "At early dawn" (ὄρθρου βαθείας).⁹ St. John has : "Early (πρῶί), while it was yet dark" ¹⁰ The discrepancies between these expressions are formal only. If contradiction there is, it lies chiefly in St. Mark's own apparently inconsistent clauses, "very early," and

¹ Cf. Matthew xxvi. 12.

² Matthew xxvii. 61.

³ Matthew xxviii. 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ Mark xvi. 2.

⁶ Alford wrote : "The independence and distinctness of the four narratives in this part have never been questioned" (on Matthew xxviii. 1). This, too, needs qualifying.

⁷ Matthew xxviii. 1. Meyer observes : "Consequently the point of time mentioned here is substantially identical with that given in Luke xxiv. 1, and in John xx. 1" (*in loc.*).

⁸ Mark xvi. 2.

⁹ Luke xxiv. 1.

¹⁰ John xx. 1.

“when the sun was risen.”¹ As the Evangelist cannot be supposed to intend verbally to contradict himself within the compass of one verse, his language must reasonably be construed to mean: “At early dawn, when the sun was just above the horizon.” Similarly, St. Matthew’s “late on the Sabbath” cannot reasonably be put into contradiction with his own explanatory clause: “As it began to dawn towards the first day of the week.” It is not, as the context shows,² Saturday night that is meant, but the period of darkness ending at dawn of the following morning (thus Meyer, Alford, etc.). The view advocated by some that St. Matthew, borrowing from St. Mark, here combines inconsistent clauses by dropping out St. Mark’s mention of the purchase of spices between, is,³ as Meyer remarks, untenable. It is not St. Mark’s language that is used, and St. Matthew may be credited with sufficient knowledge of Greek to keep him from perpetrating so obvious a blunder. St. John’s “while it was yet dark” presents no difficulty when the situation is recalled. The women began to arrive just as day was breaking, and it was daylight before they left the place. Mary Magdalene had light enough to see that the stone was taken away.⁴

3. The third crucial fact in the history—one which,

¹ Scholars are well agreed that the aorist participle here can only bear the sense: “After the sun was risen.”

² Some, as McClellan, *The New Testament*, pp. 512–13, insist that St. Matthew’s “late on the Sabbath” can only mean Saturday evening, and explain the subsequent clause by the help of Luke xxiii. 54, “And the Sabbath drew on” (ἐπέφωσκε). But the events that follow in St. Matthew plainly belong to the morning of the first day. McClellan acknowledges that “nearly every modern writer of importance [a long list] interprets St. Matthew’s phrases as of Sunday morning.”

³ Thus Lake, p. 57; W. C. Allen, *St. Matthew*, pp. 300–1, etc.: so, too, Caspari, (*Chron. Introd.*, E.T., p. 240). Allen says: “Matthew, by omitting Mark’s reference to the purchase of perfumes, has combined two entirely inconsistent notes of time.” But see Meyer, *in loc.*

⁴ John xx. 1: “Twilight in that latitude does not last for more than a quarter of an hour” (Latham, *The Risen Master*, p. 225).

in connexion with succeeding incidents, establishes the reality of the Resurrection, is that, when the women reached the tomb of Jesus on that Easter morning, after much dubiety as to how they were to obtain entrance, they found *the stone rolled away and the tomb empty*. Here, again, there is entire unanimity among the witnesses.¹ St. Matthew alone tells of *how* the stone was removed—of “a great earthquake,” and the descent of an angel of the Lord, who rolled away the stone, and sat upon it, before whose dazzling aspect the keepers became as dead men.² But all the Evangelists agree that the stone, the rolling away of which had caused the women much concern (“who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the tomb?”)³ was found rolled away, and that the tomb was empty, when the women arrived. In St. Mark’s words: “And looking up, they see that the stone is rolled back; for it was exceeding great.”⁴ Or in St. Luke’s: “And they found the stone rolled away from the tomb. And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus.”⁵ According to St. John, the emptiness of the tomb was subsequently verified by St. Peter and St. John himself.⁶ Moreover, while St. Matthew alone gives the story of the rolling away of the stone by the angel, the implication in all the other narratives is that the stone was removed by supernatural power. No human hand had effected this wonder. St. Matthew, therefore, only narrates in objective fashion—a reflection, possibly, of the terrified imagination of some of the guards—what the other Evangelists postulate. What really had happened the women

¹ Matthew xxviii. 2-7; Mark xvi. 3-6; Luke xxiv. 2-6; John xx. 1, 11, 12.

² Matthew xxviii. 2-4.

³ Mark xvi. 3.

⁴ Verse 4.

⁵ Luke xxiv. 2, 3.

⁶ John xx. 3-9; cf. Luke xxiv. 12.

were soon to learn from angelic announcements to themselves. Jesus had risen, as He said.¹

Here, then, are two facts in the history of the Resurrection—the *stone rolled away*, and the *empty tomb*—attested about as well as facts can be, with the belief of the whole primitive Church behind them. There is not a hint anywhere that the fact of the empty tomb was ever questioned by either friend or foe. It would have been easy to question or disprove it when the Apostles were boldly proclaiming the Resurrection in Jerusalem a few weeks later.² But no one appears to have done so. The other fact of the rolling away of the stone with which the tomb had been closed is involved in the tomb being found empty. Taken as they stand—much more when taken in connexion with what succeeds—the two facts support belief in the Resurrection. What is to be said of them?

There are here only two courses if the Resurrection is disputed. Either (1) the facts may be denied, and the evidence set aside, as when it is argued that the empty tomb is itself an inference from belief in the Resurrection.³ Or (2) the facts may be admitted, and a “natural” explanation be sought for them. The extremer view has already been alluded to, and need not longer detain us. It is interesting only for its implied admission that the belief of the Apostolic Church was belief in a bodily Rising. Undoubtedly every believer in the Resurrection of Christ, St. Paul included, held as part of that belief that the tomb of Jesus was left empty. But the emptiness of the tomb was not a deduction from prior belief in the Resurrection—the Apostles were guilty of no such *hysteron proteron*—but was a fact by itself, adequately attested, and one of the grounds of belief in that divine occurrence. In

¹ Matthew xxviii. 6.

² Acts ii. 24, 31; iii. 15; iv. 10, etc.

³ Thus Strauss, Weizsäcker, Keim, etc.

recent times, accordingly, the other alternative is that more commonly adopted. It is becoming usual to accept the fact of the empty tomb, and to seek for it, since the Resurrection is not admitted, some natural explanation. The study of these explanations is extremely instructive. Dr. Rashdall is quoted by Professor Lake as saying that "were the testimony fifty times stronger than it is, any hypothesis would be more possible than that" of a physical resuscitation.¹ Only in the light of these "more possible" explanations is the strength of the evidence for the Resurrection of Jesus fully disclosed.

If the tomb was empty on the morning of that third day, and Jesus did not rise, some other hands must secretly have removed the body. Who did it? The old theory of fraud on the part of the disciples² has now no respectable advocates, and may be put out of account. Who, then, effected the removal? Pilate? The Sanhedrim—the enemies of Jesus? This has been actually defended,³ but may also be passed over.⁴ But glance at more recent solutions.

O. Holtzmann gives the following account. The honourable councillor, Joseph of Arimathæa, having first, as the Gospels relate, permitted the burial of Jesus in his rock-tomb, felt on reflection that it would not do to have the body of a man who had been crucified lying among the dead in his respectable family vault. He, therefore, when the Sabbath was past, had the body of Jesus secretly removed, and buried elsewhere. Such, this author thinks, is "the simplest explanation of the mysterious occur-

¹ Lake, *ut supra*, p. 269.

² Reimarus and some of the Deists. The calumny noted in Matthew xxviii. 12-15, is an additional proof that the tomb was found empty.

³ E.g., by A. Réville, Schwartzkopff, etc.: cf. A. Meyer, *ut supra*, pp. 17-18.

⁴ Renan admits the empty tomb, but judiciously refrains from explanations. Cf. Latham, *The Risen Master*, pp. 6-9.

rence.”¹ It is implied, of course, that the secret was carefully kept from the disciples, who were allowed to believe that their Master had risen. This interesting little deception of Joseph, so likely in a good man, and first brought to light in these last years, successfully took in the whole Christian Church, and, combined with imaginary appearances, created its faith in the Resurrection !

So transparent a piece of trickery does not appeal to Professor Lake, who gives a solution on different lines. The facts, he thinks, were probably these. The women came in the dusk of morning to an empty tomb, which they mistakenly took to be that of Jesus. The neighbourhood of Jerusalem was full of rock-tombs, and it was easy to go wrong. A young man, standing near, tried to convince them of their error, and pointed them to where the Lord really lay. [This is the young man, as previously seen, whom legend, according to Professor Lake, transforms into an angel, and also into the Risen Lord.] But the women fled. Professor Lake's own words deserve to be quoted : “The women came in the early morning to a tomb which they thought was the one in which they had seen the Lord buried. They expected to find a closed tomb, but they found an open one ; and a young man, who was in the entrance, guessing their errand, tried to tell them that they had made a mistake in the place. ‘He is not here,’ said he ; ‘see the place where they laid Him,’ and probably pointed to the next tomb. But the women were frightened at the detection of their error, and fled, only imperfectly or not at all understanding what they heard. It was only later on, when they knew that the Lord had risen [from visions of the disciples in Galilee],

¹ *Leben Jesu*, pp. 392-3. The germ of the theory is found in H. J. Holtzmann's, *Die Synoptiker*, p. 105. Cf. the criticism in A. Meyer, pp. 118-19.

and—on their view—that His tomb must be empty, that they came to believe that the young man was something more than they had seen; that he was not telling them of their mistake, but announcing the Resurrection, and that his intention was to give them a message for the disciples.”¹

As a “natural” explanation, this fairly rivals Paulus. But will any one believe that such a mistake of a few women is really the foundation on which the Christian Church has built its Easter hope, or affords an adequate explanation of the revolutionary effects in the faith and hope of the disciples which, according to all the narratives, were wrought by the experiences of that Easter morning? If so, he has a strange idea of the relation of causes and effects. The theory, it need hardly be pointed out, is itself an invention, without historical support or probability—a travesty of the narratives as we have them. There is no evidence of a mistake of the women, who knew too well where the Lord was laid;² or of the presence of the obliging young man, weeks after identified with an angel *within* the tomb; or of a mistake of the import of the message. Were the women the only persons who visited the spot? Did no one think of verifying their tale? Did they never themselves go back and discover their error? Whence this consentient and mistaken conviction that the tomb was found empty on the third day, and that a message came from it that the Lord had risen? As a “more possible” hypothesis Professor Lake’s theory may safely be set aside.

A last example is taken from A. Meyer, who, in his book *Die Auferstehung Christi*, after criticising and rejecting previous theories, gives what he conjectures may be the

¹ *Ut supra*, pp. 251–2.

² Mark xv. 47; Luke xxiii. 55.

true version of events. The passage is an excellent example of the process of manufacturing history out of moonshine. He says: "If one seeks for an historical kernel behind the narrative of Mark, it is not difficult to picture to oneself how, perhaps, after some time [indefinite], in the early morning, veiled women, disciples of Jesus, crept forth, sad and despairing, to seek the tomb and the body; how they, perchance, had inquired about the place, how they stood some time helpless before a huge stone, and said, 'Oh, if only some one would roll away that stone for us'; then again in doubt before an empty cave, not knowing whether the Lord might have lain there, and some one have taken Him away; how they may have often repeated such search, until at last the news and summons came from Galilee, 'Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not there, give up your seeking: He is long ago risen and has appeared to Simon and the others; come and hear it for yourselves.'"¹ It has only to be said of this flight of fancy that, when compared with the narrative of the Gospels, it has no substance or feature of reality in it. It contradicts the tradition at every point. There is no "historical kernel," for the ground of history is abandoned for imagination. The visit of the women is cut away from the third day: is unhistorically represented as repeated and resultless; the message which came from the tomb is brought weeks later from Galilee, etc. Opposed to the Gospels, it is opposed equally to the theories already adduced. Unbelief here also lacks unity in its hypotheses. It shatters itself against the moveless rock of the facts.

4. And now the Easter history reaches its climax. The facts already reviewed—the third day, the visit of the women, the stone supernaturally removed, the empty tomb—lead up to, and find their natural culmination in,

¹ P. 124.

*the angelic vision and message that the Lord had risen.*¹ Here once more it is permissible to speak of at least essential agreement in the narratives. Particulars and phraseology in the accounts vary, as before, in a manner incompatible with dependence. St. Luke, e.g., speaks of two angels where St. Matthew and St. Mark mention only one; and in the part of the angel's message relating to Galilee St. Luke gives the words a quite different turn from what they have in the other Gospels.² St. John's account stands again by itself. Yet all the Synoptical narratives agree that, while the women stood, perplexed and affrighted at or within the tomb, they received a vision of angels; that the announcement was made to them that the Lord had risen; that they were invited to see the place where He had lain; that they had given them a message to take to the disciples. In the central part of the message: "He is not here; He is risen," there is *verbal* agreement: only St. Matthew and St. Luke reverse the order of the clauses. St. Mark breaks off with the women fleeing from the tomb in "trembling and astonishment";³ but there can be no reasonable doubt that his Gospel also, not less than the others, contemplated a report of the angelic message to the disciples, and a narrative of certain of the appearances.⁴ According to St. Matthew and St. Luke, the report was made on the same day.⁵ The Apostles were, therefore, still in Jerusalem, and the fiction of their having already dispersed to Galilee is proved to be baseless.

The Lord had risen! There were no witnesses of that august event; but the fact was made certain to the faith

¹ Matthew xxviii. 5-8; Mark xvi. 6-8; Luke xxiv. 4-11; John xx. 1, 11-12.

² Luke xxiv. 6, 7; cf. Matthew xxviii. 7; Mark xvi. 7.

³ Mark xvi. 8.

⁴ Cf. the remarks in Menzies, *The Earliest Gospel*, p. 120.

⁵ Matthew xxviii. 3; Luke xxiv. 9-11, 22, 23.

of the disciples by the empty grave, by the angelic vision, and by the subsequent appearances of Jesus Himself. The time of the Resurrection is not told, but it is implied that it synchronized with the convulsion of nature which St. Matthew describes, and with the rolling away of that stone by the angel which terrified and prostrated the guards. It therefore anteceded by some time the visit of the women. There is no need to suppose that the guards were still there when the women arrived. It may rather be presumed that, on recovery from their terror, they betook themselves away as speedily as they could. Neither need the angel of St. Matthew be understood to be still sitting on the stone as at the first. His language to the women—"Come, see the place where the Lord lay"—rather implies that, as in other Gospels, he addresses them from *within* the tomb.

It is not to be gainsaid that we have here a story of supernatural events. The narratives are steeped in the supernatural. The supernatural element may be resisted, but it must at least be conceded that the account goes together on its own assumption that a tremendous miracle—the Resurrection of the Lord—really took place. It was before remarked that in all the Gospels there is the implication of supernatural power in the removal of the stone. A physical convulsion was the natural accompaniment of so great a marvel.¹ The appearance of the angel is in keeping with what is told of the later appearances of the angels to the women. The reality of the angelic appearances, again, is vouched for by the message which, according to all the witnesses, the women received, and which they subsequently conveyed to the disciples. That message is the kernel of the whole story. It is the "Easter Message"

¹ Cf. the darkness, earthquake, and rending of the Temple veil at the Crucifixion. Matthew xxvii. 15, 51; Mark xv. 33, 37; Luke xxiii. 44, 45.

which has changed the face of the world. If anything stands fast in the Resurrection history, it is that this message did not spring from their own sad, despairing hearts, but was given them by celestial visitants at the tomb.

So closely, in truth, is this message which the women received bound up with the "vision of angels,"¹ that it is difficult to see how the one is to be believed, if the other is rejected.² The difference in the accounts of the vision, though Strauss and later sceptics have made much of them, are not of a nature to occasion serious difficulty. There may really have been two angels, as in the experience of Mary Magdalene,³ though only one is mentioned by St. Matthew and St. Mark: or St. Luke, in his summary narrative, may be combining the experience of Mary Magdalene with that of the other women. But there is a further consideration suggested by the nature of vision itself. Whether or not it is right to speak of "ecstasy" in such an experience, it is certain that the state of "vision" (*ὄπτασία*) is not simply an extension of ordinary perception. It is not a state of pure objectivity. It is not on the outer but on the inner senses that an impression is made in the apprehension of the supersensible. There is, in Old Testament phrase, an "opening of the eyes,"⁴ a raising of consciousness to a higher plane. What is seen is real, but there is a subjective element in the seeing. It follows that in a vision like that of the women at the tomb the experience of one is not necessarily the measure of the experience of another. When notes were compared, all would not be found to have had exactly the same percep-

¹ Luke xxiv. 23.

² There seems to the present writer no incredibility in the supposition of a higher spiritual world capable of manifesting itself, but much to favour the idea. Whatever the theory of Christ's knowledge, this is precisely one of the things on which His intuition might be trusted.

³ John xx. 12.

⁴ Cf. Numbers xxiv. 3, 16; 2 Kings vi. 17, etc.

tions. Especially would this be the case if there were different companies, or if the experiences registered were not those of the same moment. Yet in the main the perceptions *did* agree. Forms of men ("a young man," Mark; "two men," Luke);¹ "appearance like lightning, and raiment white as snow" (Matthew); "arrayed in white robe" (Mark); "in dazzling apparel" (Luke); "in white" (John). Above all do the narratives agree in the words of comfort: "Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which hath been crucified. He is not here; for He is risen, even as He said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay" (Matthew). "Be not amazed; ye seek Jesus, the Nazarene, which hath been crucified: He is risen; He is not here; behold the place where they laid Him!" (Mark). "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen" (Luke).

From St. Mark and St. Luke² we learn that the women had "entered" and inspected the tomb before this wonderful experience befell them. It is not strange that, when it came, they were "amazed" (Mark) and "affrighted" (Luke), and needed the reassurance given them. The message they received for the disciples, that Jesus was going before them into Galilee, where they would see Him, with its important variation in St. Luke, will better be considered in connexion with the appearances. The events at the tomb ended with the hasty departure of the women—"with fear and great joy," says St. Matthew;³ "with trembling and astonishment," because of their fear, declares St. Mark,⁴ saying nothing to any one, as

¹ Mr. Latham's idea that the "visitants to the tomb" (and at the Ascension) may have been persons (Essenes?) from Jerusalem (*Risen Master*, pp. 412-19), is a strange aberration. The rationalistic theory that the women may have been deceived by the glint of the grave clothes is left unnoticed.

² Mark xvi. 5; Luke xxiv. 5.

³ Matthew xxviii. 8.

⁴ Mark xvi. 8.

they hasted to fulfil their commission to the disciples. St. Mark's Gospel, at this point, on the usual view, breaks off: not, however, before it has told us the things it is most essential for us to know.¹

JAMES ORR.

THE SOCIAL TEACHING OF THE LAW.

"THE Prophets are the beating heart of the Old Testament. Later study has shown that they were the real makers of the unique religious life of Israel." With these words, Professor Rauschenbusch begins his stimulating chapter on the social teaching of the Old Testament.² As a matter of fact, on this side of the prophetic teaching, there is far more affinity with the Law than is often supposed. As Professor Kent has remarked, "Law and prophecy are not antithetic, as is often imagined, but rather different expressions of the same divine revelation, one through the life and struggles of the nation, the other through the experience and mind of single divinely enlightened men. . . . The lawgivers were in closest touch with that life, and, therefore, in their writings picture it most concretely and vividly."³ It is true, indeed, that the prophets have been the great proclaimers of social righteousness, not only for Israel, but for the world as a whole. But after all the prophets were but voices crying in the wilderness. Their discourses have the air of one long protest. For the real spirit of Hebrew life, or rather for what was best in that life, we must turn to the Law.

¹ The Gospel, ending at chap. xvi. 8, is manifestly incomplete. Dean Burgon unquestionably makes out a strong case for suspense of judgment with regard to the remaining verses (9-20). (Cf. his *Last Twelve Verses of St Mark*). But it is safer to regard the verses as an early appendix. The problems which this raises must here stand over.

² *Christianity and the Social Crisis*, p. 3.

³ *Israel's Laws and Legal Precedents*, p. v.

In speaking of the Law it is still necessary to remember that law in Old Testament times was very different from law as we understand it to-day. We speak of the Hebrew code or codes ; but those codes were merely the embodiment from time to time of slowly hardening custom ; law, indeed, was nothing but custom in process of crystallization.¹ True of all more primitive nations, this statement is specially true of the Hebrews, and in no other nation can we watch this process with quite the same clearness. Further, we are thus enabled to see how extremely conservative was the Hebrew spirit. Separated as the different codes may have been by centuries, we find the same principles repeated, often almost in the same words. Where there are differences, the differences only point to a desire to retain as much as could possibly be retained. It is precisely the same conservatism which has given to all the Historical Books the character of compilations, and has left us so many a critical problem as to the distinction between source, author, reviser and redactor.

Looked at from this point of view, the Law is very different from that mass of ritual ordinances with which it is generally identified. True, the latter is the sense the word bears oftenest in the New Testament ; but Christ's two fundamental principles of morality, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," are both taken from the Law (Deut. vi. 5 ; Lev. xix. 18 ; see Matt. xxii. 37, v. 43). In the earliest code, indeed, remarkably little space is devoted to ritual (at most, 8 verses out of 86). The rights of slaves and of women, the compensation for crimes of violence, for negligence and theft, and for betrayal of trust, the prohibition of oppression and usury and fraud, cessation of labour on the

¹ See Benzinger in Hauck's *Realencyclopädie*, vol. vi. p. 573. Cf. also *Wisdom*, xiv. 16.

seventh day and in the seventh year—all these leave to ritual only a sentence or two. The same thing may be said of the Decalogue (Ex. xx. 1–17, Deut. v. 6–21). In the second Decalogue, probably the earlier of the two (Exod. xxxiv. 14–26), the prohibitions refer chiefly to acts of a more ritual character; but these acts have nothing to do with the service of a temple or even a tabernacle; they are simply the expression of the religious fellowship of a primitive pastoral and agricultural people.¹

This is only what was to be expected. If formal and comprehensive statutes are characteristic of all modern society, custom (possessed of a still more unquestioned authority) is equally characteristic of early times. In all early societies two great needs are felt; to know how to act towards God, and towards man. In neither of these can there be any innovation. What has been done “by the fathers” is the only safe guide. But this necessitates the existence of certain individuals who should be able to tell us the exact usage of our fathers. In the matter of religion, we call these men priests, and what they can tell us as to the right way of approaching God is their “instruction” or “Torah.” We shall need their “Torah” to guide us as to the right times for our religious gatherings (though we shall not be likely altogether to forget these); also, still more, for the particular offerings which are acceptable to God, for the right way of presenting them, for the knowledge of how much of them we may enjoy ourselves, and how much we must leave to the priests, as well as for the circumstances which render us unclean, that is, unable to approach to God at all (cf. Ezek. xliv. 23, Lev. x. 11); and we find that in process of time these

¹ C. F. Kent (*op. cit.* pp. 26 ff.) points out that the Book of the Covenant and the earlier laws in Deuteronomy suggest that the first Hebrew codes were arranged in pairs of pentads, dealing with the rights of slaves, assaults, domestic animals, property, social purity, kindness, justice, piety, sacred seasons.



various "instructions" or laws ("Toroth") become considerably elaborated. In reference to our relations with other men, we shall be equally in need of authoritative decisions from the priests, and also, in this case, from judges—wise and experienced and influential men—who are accustomed to sit in the gate of the town or village, and whose verdicts upon our quarrels with one another no one ventures to dispute. In most cases these judges will feel no rivalry towards the priests, but will be glad to avail themselves of the priests' special knowledge. In any case, our "instructions" will include all which either priests or judges can tell us.¹

In all early society the most potent factor is the family or the tribe. Either the family or the tribe (sometimes the one gains the chief place, sometimes the other) is the centre of all religious practices; it is also the centre of human and social life. To carry on the worship of a god or gods is the duty of the family as a whole, rather than of individuals. The family rather than the individual is also responsible for crime, and is indeed regarded as the real agent thereof. (For the importance of the family in Palestine see Exod. xiii. 8 f.; Gen. xv. 3, xxx. 1; Jud. xi. 1; Josh. vii. 24; 1 Sam. xx. 29; Lev. xx. 5, 9, etc.)

Again, in all early society, and more particularly in the East, the administration of justice is always more or less informal. There are no police, few formally appointed magistrates, scarcely any machinery for punishing contempt of court. The majesty of the Law depends entirely on the power or will of some individual to maintain it. The early Hebrew judges rose into the position they occupied solely because of their own personal gifts. The same is true of

¹ *Nómos* (law) includes the two ideas of *jus* (what is just and fair), and *lex* (a positive enactment embodying *jus*); and also, in Old Testament language, *torah*, a more or less formal precept for guidance, and *mishpat*, a definite decision.

Samuel. Even under the monarchy, justice depended a good deal on the character of individual monarchs (2 Sam. xii. 5, xiv. 10 ; 1 Kings iii. 28). If this were wanting, every man was let free to do that which was right in his own eyes. Hence the continual possibility of the oppression of the weak by the strong, of the poor by the rich ; and hence, too, the peculiar precariousness, hardly intelligible to us except when we think of the "submerged tenth," of the position of the widow and the fatherless, and of those who are bereft of any natural protector. Another individual in danger of such oppression was the "stranger" or resident alien, who had no family or tribe to fall back upon in his adopted country ; yet another was the Levite, whose tribe had no local habitation, but whose inheritance was scattered up and down the country.¹

Now "custom" may do one of two things : it may simply provide for wrong done by man against man, "keeping the ring," so to speak—making rules for the struggle for existence and forbidding that struggle to pass beyond certain limits ; or it may modify the spirit in which the struggle is carried on, and, in the case of the weaker combatants, forbid the struggle altogether. This is what happened in Palestine. For those who had no natural protector, custom or law ordained that the community itself should be the protector ; that is, that weakness and helplessness should themselves constitute sufficient claim for support and care. It went further. The struggle for existence between man and man was far less keen in early times than to-day ; but the Law introduced into it, and also into the "wild justice" of primitive life, a humanity and kindness and even

¹ Maine's well-known formula, that human history shows a constant advance "from status to contract" has been abundantly substantiated since his time. Hebrew society was fundamentally in the stage of "status." Hence the danger of those who had no recognized status in the nation.

decency, for which the world has been the richer ever since.¹

It is worth while to consider the different codes in detail with reference to this point. Let us take them in order, beginning with the Book of the Covenant, which represents the more primitive Hebrew practices up to the days of the early monarchy; passing to the Deuteronomic Code, which represents the ideals of the seventh century; the Holiness Code, dating from the last days of the Southern kingdom; and the Priestly legislation, promulgated when the Hebrew nation had become the Jewish Church.

First, then, the Book of the Covenant (Exod. xxi.–xxiii. 19). The code opens with a law peculiar to the Hebrews, that no Hebrew slave might be kept in slavery for more than six years, except under special conditions.² After various provisions, some of which at least appear to modify more barbarous practices, oppression of the widow and fatherless (the “stranger” and the Levite are not mentioned here) is stringently forbidden, as also is lending to the poor for interest, or keeping a security for more than a single day; “for I am gracious” (ch. xxii. 21–27). After another short passage on offerings and technical holiness, the code returns to general exhortations to justice, helpfulness, refusal of bribes, and equity to the “stranger”; “for ye were strangers.”³ The remaining provisions (ch. xxiii. 10–19)

¹ Hammurabi's laws begin regularly with the phrase “If a man . . .” Of the plain imperative (cf. “Ye shall not afflict any widow,” Exod. xxii. 22) they are as ignorant as they are of the categorical duties, not only of piety, but of humanity, which, in the Hebrew codes, the imperatives introduce.

² In Exodus xxii. 3, the thief who cannot restore what he has stolen is to be enslaved. Jos. Ant. xvi. i. 1 implies that in this case also release was to take place at the end of the seventh year. Hammurabi's code condemns such a thief to death in the case of theft “from temple or palace.” See also Genesis xlv. 9.

³ The participation of slaves in family life is also emphasized, Deut. xii. 18, xvi. 11; cf. also Exodus xx. 8 (= Deut. v. 14), xxi. 7, and xii. 43.

deal with the repose of the seventh year and day, feasts, first-fruits, and the prohibited practice of seething a kid in its mother's milk. Of the ceremonial parts of this code, the Decalogue of Exodus xxxiv. seems to be a summary. The Decalogue of Exodus xx., on the other hand, in the form in which we have it, is an independent statement of the conditions of monotheism and of any stable social life whatever.

Let us now turn to Deuteronomy. The interval between this code and its predecessor is marked by the growth of wealth, the rise of prophecy and the invasion of Hebrew politics by the ambitions of Egypt and Assyria.¹ The little Hebrew nation, perched upon its hills apart from the foot of men, has been drawn into the turbulent current of the world's history—a sufficiently striking change. What do we find in the code which the seventh century produced? First of all, we notice that a new prominence is given to the Levite (Deut. xii. 12), “forasmuch he has no portion or inheritance with you”² (comp. vv. 18 and 19, and chh. x. 9, xiv. 27); and in the second place, the references to the fatherless and widow, as well as to the “stranger,” are repeated with emphasis (xiv. 19, xvi. 11 and 14). Next comes the abolition of debt (*novæ tabulæ*) for Hebrews (not for “strangers”) every seven years, and, in addition, readiness to lend without interest to the poor (contrast xv. 11, “For the poor shall never cease out of the land,” with v. 4, “There shall be no poor with you”). Against the existence of poverty is to be waged a πόλεμος ἄσπονδος. The old rule about the release of the Hebrew slave is repeated, with the addition of a gift to set him up in his new life of freedom (observe v. 18, “it shall not

¹ Klostermann has recently suggested that Deuteronomy contains material which takes us back to the judicial decisions of Samuel and others: if this is correct, it only emphasizes the conservatism of the structure of the book.

² Cf. Judges xvii. 7, xviii. 4.

seem hard unto thee when thou lettest him go free from thee").¹ Later (xvi. 18–20), we have the old protest against oppression and the wresting of justice; the Cities of Refuge are appointed (xix. 1 ff.), and (equally important in oriental communities) the warning against removing a neighbour's landmark (a subject which is constantly referred to in Babylonian laws and inscriptions); wilful crime is forbidden; the old law of retaliation is reaffirmed; and in the matter of levies for war, the faint-hearted and those who have urgent private matters are allowed exemption (ch. xx. 1–9); while in the siege and capture of cities, though the male population is to be exterminated, women and children are to be saved, except in Canaan itself, and fruit-trees are to remain untouched. Something more than what was often considered justice for women is laid down in Deuteronomy xxi. 10–14, xxii. 13 ff. and 22, and xxi. 15–17.

The precepts of kindness and helpfulness reappear in chapter xxii. 1–4, with the addition of the interesting commands that a bird is not to be taken from a nest along with the eggs, and that battlements are to be placed upon the flat roofs of houses (apparently to avoid the contamination of the spilling of blood, as much as out of motives of pure humanity). In addition to this should be noticed, outside the legislative body of the book, the provision of Cities of Refuge (another modification of the "wild justice" of the blood-feud), and the statement that the widow and fatherless are the special care of Jehovah (x. 18). After the mode of investigating a charge of unfaithfulness (Deuteronomy knows nothing of the "water of jealousy," Num. v. 11 ff.), the punishments for seduction and rape are given (xxii. 23–29 :

¹ Hammurabi has no corresponding law, but ordains (§ 117) that when a debtor has handed over his wife or child to work off a debt (a case which would be responsible for a good deal of Hebrew slavery also) the slavery was to come to an end after three years.

if the offence is committed in the open country, the woman is unpunished ; no one could have heard a cry for help) ; cleanliness in camp is carefully ordained ; an escaped slave is not to be returned to his master ; usury is forbidden once more (to a Hebrew, but not to a foreigner ; it is really an unwarrantable taking advantage of a brother's need ; cf. Ezek. xviii. 17) ; and the plucking of grapes and corn in another's field is allowed (xxiii. 9, 15, 19, 24). A bridegroom is to be free from military service for a year (cf. xx. 7, and Luke xiv. 20), the mill and the upper mill-stone are not to be taken in pledge, and the kidnapping of Hebrews is forbidden (xxxiii. 5-7) ; after which comes a noteworthy group of provisions regarding securities for loans, punctual payment of wages, and liberal "gleanings" (xxiv. 10-22) ; the ox, while at work on the corn, is not to be muzzled (xxv. 4), and weights and measures are to be exact (xxv. 13-16).

It will be noticed that, as Driver has pointed out, there is hardly a precept here which is not in spirit an expansion of the earlier law ; but the fact that such humane practices were expected is in itself highly significant. We might have supposed that the new conditions of commercial life, with all the stress and hardness that they would entail, would render the milder principles of the "good old times" impracticable. Instead, Hebrew faith clung to them with pathetic loyalty. Nothing in the Deuteronomic Code is more noteworthy than the fact that, in spite of all the influence of Assyria and Egypt upon Palestine, the seventh century code shows neither more nor less affinity with Egyptian or Babylonian codes than the Book of the Covenant ; it is purely Hebrew from beginning to end.¹

¹ How far Babylonian affinities are the result of direct Babylonian influence cannot be discussed here. It is at least probable that the main ideas of Hebrew law go back to the desert, i.e. are older than the period when the Hebrews entered the "Babylonian" civilization of Canaan.

We now turn to the Holiness Code (Lev. xvii.–xxvi.), which is generally attributed to the period which saw Ezekiel's activity. As the name implies, this code is chiefly concerned with questions of technical cleanliness, i.e. the physical conditions which allow or forbid participation in worship or in the life of the community. But to the authors of this code also, humanity is of the utmost importance. After the laws for the slaughter of animals (xvii.), the various kinds of incest are forbidden at great length, and also idolatrous worship (xviii. 1–xix. 8). Then follows a passage which is as remarkable as any in Deuteronomy. The gleanings both of cornfield and vineyard are to be left for the poor ; wages are to be paid at sunset ; and, characteristically enough, the deaf are not to be cursed, nor a stumblingblock put before the blind ; there is to be no partiality in the administration of justice ; no grudges are to be borne, or gossip spread ; the aged are to be honoured and the "stranger" is to be treated as a Hebrew ("thou shalt love him as thyself"). The passage concludes with the enforcement of honesty in weights and measures (xix. 9–37 ; comp. xxiv. 22, and Num. xv. 14–16).¹ The command to leave a portion for the poor is repeated in chapter xxiii. 22 ; then, in chapter xxv., in addition to a seventh year of fallow (the seventh year of release does not seem to be mentioned here), is ordained a fiftieth year of release, when land should revert to its original owner (sales shortly before this year of release are to have their prices modified in view of it). Thus there will be no permanent alienation of property ; where lands or houses have been sold, the next of kin are always to have the right of redemption ; in this way any continued impoverishment of Hebrews,

¹ It may here be noticed that the penalty of burning is mentioned twice in Hammurabi and twice in the Pentateuch, in both cases in this code (Lev. xx. 14, and xxi. 9).

it is hoped, will be avoided ; " for unto me the children of Israel are servants " (xxv. 55).¹

The social provisions of this code are as striking as those of Deuteronomy. It must have been reaching its present form when the Southern kingdom was in its death throes, and when, as we can see from Jeremiah's memoirs, justice was almost driven from the land beneath a weak king and an unscrupulous aristocracy. Yet the old Hebrew ideals remained stronger rather than weaker, even when the ritual interest had gained a new force ; and at what would seem the moment of the nation's break-up, the legislator is making a new provision for the permanence of the society he loves.

The years which saw the formation of the Holiness Code were followed by the prophecies of second-Isaiah, and the weary century which preceded the return of Ezra and the promulgation of the Law in 444 B.C. Whether this Law included the codes which we have already considered is uncertain ; but what was characteristic of Ezra and his school was the Priests' Code (the legal parts of Exodus, excepting xx.-xxiii., Leviticus i.-xv., Numbers). This code is obviously intended for a community whose main business is religion ; provisions concerning ritual occupy a far larger place in it than had been the case before. The social interest, it must be confessed, falls definitely into the background ; indeed, in some instances, it seems to be purposely pushed on one side. Thus, the reason for the Sabbath is said to be its importance as a sign rather than as a means of rest (Exod. xxxi. 12). The ransom for each man's soul (Exod.

¹ It has often been held that chapter xxv. is distinct in origin from the rest of the Holiness Code ; cf. Benzinger, *op. cit.* p. 583, Kent, *op. cit.* p. 132 ; Engert, *Ehe- und Familienrecht der Hebräer*, p. 73. Ezekiel xlvi. 17 mentions a year of release (without specifying 7th or 50th). Many examples of such redistribution in other countries can be given. The early English Manor, in which a third of the arable land lay fallow each year, was divided annually among its inhabitants.

xxx. 15) is to be the same for the poor as for the rich (another and more democratic reason, however, might be given for this precept). The whole notion of uprightness or the reverse seems to be confused, when an act may be called sin and so may make a man guilty, though it has been done unwittingly (Lev. iv. 22). The injunctions of humanity, care for the widow and the "stranger," and helpfulness to neighbours, disappear. We have, however, the following echoes of them in Leviticus vi. 1-7 ; (a) false dealing with a neighbour is identified with a trespass against the Lord ; restitution is to be the original sum plus one-fifth as well as a guilt offering, which is identical with the penalty for a "trespass in the holy things of the Lord" (Lev. v. 15) ; (b) with regard to the uncleanness of objects touched by something that is already unclean (Lev. xi. 36), an exception is made in the case of seed and springs of running water ; (c) the somewhat costly offering after the birth of a child is modified in the case of the poor (Lev. xii. 1-8 ; comp. Luke xxiv. ; see also Lev. v. 7, xiv. 21). The detailed regulations for avoiding or repairing the uncleanness of leprosy have in view the general preservation and convenience (Lev. xiv. 26) of the community ; and although these provisions are looked upon as purely religious (Lev. xv. 31), there can be no doubt that they had their origin in the primitive struggle for sanitation. The provision of Cities of Refuge (six) is repeated, and the care with which the Holiness Code guarded against the alienation of property reappears in the special provisions for the maintenance of tribal inheritances (Num. xxxvi.).

We cannot fail to notice here how the most distinctive and characteristic portions of the earlier law have disappeared—almost as completely as the primitive laws about personal violence and strayed cattle contained in the Book of the Covenant. But the Priests' Code cannot be said to be a reflection

of life as were its predecessors ; its purpose was specific, namely, to provide a ritual, which in its mass of detail should make impossible the disastrous cults of the past. That the law of Jehovah in its broadest sense was still regarded as regulating the relations of man to man is clear enough from numerous passages in the Psalms. The "precepts" and "statutes" of Psalm cxix. inspire the same enthusiastic delight and affection which are so prominent in Deuteronomy. Details of ritual, conditions of social life, were constantly changing ; the law of humanity and kindness, of justice and mercy, was abiding ; it was the really permanent part of the whole law, and as such was simply and categorically reaffirmed in the New Testament.

Now let us turn for a moment to the Prophets. The eighth century, when we first meet with written prophecy, is an age of new conditions, new wealth, new worship and new oppression. As Rauschenbusch has pointed out, it is the unfamiliar that is resisted ; and the prophets unhesitatingly recall their hearers to the old piety, the old ways, the old simplicity. They do not attack the ritual of the Priests' Code, simply because it did not exist. They do not attack the simple ritual of the earlier codes ; this would seem to have been quite overshadowed by the Canaanitish or foreign cults, against which their most eager protests were levelled. None of the prophets is more outspoken than Amos. His plea for the poor and needy and unprotected is so thoroughgoing that he appears (in a spirit very different from that of the early Greek lyric poets) to identify the poor with the righteous, the rich with the fraudulent and unjust (Am. ii. 6, iv. 1, v. 11 and 24, vi. 12, viii. 4). Hosea, a few years later, lays his emphasis elsewhere. To him, the sin of the Northern kingdom was sexual impurity, both literal and metaphorical ; before this, the oppression of the poor sank

out of sight. With Isaiah it is different. There is hardly a social problem of modern times that is not referred to by the great prophet of Judah. The rich who make spoil of the poor (Isa. ii. 14); who add house to house and field to field (v. 8); who plunge into debauchery (v. 22); and who turn aside the needy from judgment, defrauding the widow and the fatherless (x. 1)—these are all pilloried in the very spirit which was to find expression nearly a century later in Deuteronomy. The Messiah is emphatically the Lord of justice and honesty, “the protector of the poor,” and the good man is primarily the upright and honest man (xxxii. 1). Isaiah’s younger contemporary, Micah, regarded the chief guilt of Judah as consisting in its disobedience to the law of humanity: devising iniquity, coveting lands, using fraudulent measures, lying in wait for blood—these bring down Jehovah’s wrath upon the whole nation (Mic. ii. 1, 2, iii. 1–3, 9, vi. 10–12, vii. 2; compare also Hab. i. 3, 4, ii. 9, 15; Zeph. iii. 1, 13).

In all this, the Prophets have not really gone a step beyond the Law.¹ They lay upon justice and humanity a far greater emphasis than does the Book of the Covenant, but not greater than does the successor of that book, the Deuteronomic Code, which was undoubtedly being prepared for while Isaiah and Micah were prophesying. And in Jeremiah we find the same note. National safety is to be gained only on the conditions that the fatherless and widow are not oppressed and innocent blood is not shed. It is the function of Jehovah to execute judgment and to deliver the spoiled from the oppressor. To build a house by unrighteousness or to withhold a workman’s wages is to bring down the severest punishment from on high (vii. 6, ix. 24, xxi. 12,

¹ Of Franckh, *Prophetie in der Zeit vor Amos*; the earliest prophets were champions of the institutions of Moses; if this is true, their successors, from Amos onwards, were carrying on the tradition.

xxii. 3 and 13). To Jeremiah also the Messiah is the exact opposite of the false shepherds who made their gain, like the sons of Samuel, by defrauding the people (xxiii. 1-8, xxxiii. 15).

In Ezekiel we find a new conception. That which rouses Jehovah's wrath is uncleanness, and uncleanness is often either physical or ceremonial. Thus, the Temple is defiled by the presence of a foreigner or by the dead body of a Hebrew. But uncleanness is also caused by oppression and rapine and fraud ; and this aspect of the wicked life is always before Ezekiel's eyes (vii. 11, xviii. 5, xxii. 7 and 29). In his catalogues of sins (see especially xviii. 5 and 9) social wrong-doing occupies a far more prominent place than either ceremonial or civic iniquity. In his new city, "strangers" are to be reckoned as Hebrews themselves (xlvii. 22; cf. Lev. xix. 34 above) and all that we are told about the princes, in addition to the special sacrifices which they must offer, is that such oppression as Ahab's is to be impossible (xlv. 9, xlvi. 18). We might even call Ezekiel's words the application of the Law of Holiness to the nation's history. As is only natural, we find less of this law in second-Isaiah. Under the new conditions of the exile, the wicked within the nation have almost ceased to trouble ; the nation lies under the heel of the foreigner, and will be vindicated by Jehovah Himself ; but in the last chapters (lvi.-lxvi.), very possibly dating after the return to Palestine, we find the old contention almost in the old words. "Keep judgment and do righteousness." Jehovah's feast is to "deal thy bread to the hungry." Jehovah is the lover of judgment (lvi. 1, lviii. 7, lxi. 8); and the real reason that calls forth the deliverer, in the majestic fifty-ninth chapter, is the absence of judgment and righteousness in the land. The same cry is heard, in spite of its absence from the Priests' Code, in the post-exilic prophets. Zechariah, in thorough Deuteronomic

fashion, bids the people, though in vain, not to oppress the widow or the fatherless or the poor, and adds "let none of you imagine evil against your brother in your heart" (vii. 10). Malachi protests against those who "oppress the hireling in his wages" (iii. 5), as Amos had done three centuries before. In Jonah a unique protest of the Deuteronomic Code finds a unique echo (Deut. xxv. 4; Jon. iv. 11)—must not God have mercy on a city wherein there is much cattle?

It is thus clear that the prophets have had no moral duties to emphasize unknown to Hebrew law. On the contrary, they move entirely within the bounds of that law. The special impression which they make upon the reader is due simply to their neglect of the ceremonial aspects of religion; this the earliest law could not entirely pass over, but it did not elbow out the other class of precepts until the main work of prophecy was done. We cannot but be struck by the simplicity with which the old Hebrew ideals were repeated, almost without enlargement, in prophecy as well as in law, in spite of the enormous widening of the horizon produced by the events of the eighth, seventh and sixth centuries. We might even have called this the result of poverty of imagination, were it not for the vigour with which these principles are applied to the complexities of social and political life alike. Further, outside prophecy and law, there is no evidence of alteration of ethical emphasis; precisely the same ideals of honesty and kindness, alike to equals and inferiors, is found in Psalm xv., Job xxxi., Proverbs xxxi. 1-9; precisely the same hope of future justice in Psalm lxxii. (notably in verse 12).¹

But though this law of social salvation and Messianic glory can be stated briefly, in its very brevity lies its com-

¹ The same ideas are found outside the canon: cf. 2 Esdras ii. 20-22. In Homer, also, poor men and slaves "come from Zeus" and so must be treated with *αἰδώς* or courteous respect.

prehensiveness. It allowed of no casuistical modification; its claims were absolute. It is the briefest law which makes the greatest demands; and it has been the glory of the Hebrews, alone among the nations of the earth, to lift their ideals to that well-nigh unapproachable height. How far was the law obeyed? Was it intended to be only an ideal? Do not the prophets imply that the part of the law which was of the most importance to them never was obeyed? Are the authors of the different codes to be compared to Homer, setting their face against certain practices common both before them and after, deliberately expunging from their representation of national life certain elements which they knew were there, and emphasizing certain other elements which they had no means of enforcing? ¹

This can hardly have been the case altogether. The codes make no difference between their various sections, ceremonial, civic and humane, as if the latter were merely counsels of perfection; and the very continuity of the codes would have been impossible apart from a corresponding continuity in the nation's actual practices and conduct. It is true that there were no adequate sanctions in the Jewish law. If an individual determined to disobey the Law "with a high hand," there was no machinery for preventing him, apart from the general sense of the community. If the nation determined to reject the Law (as in the eyes of the prophets it had done), it could only be recalled to obedience by the direct action of Jehovah. But the problems of Israel were moral rather than civic or forensic. Israel, like its hero, David, had high impulses. Often untrue to them, the nation refused to surrender its loyalty altogether,

¹ Murray, *Rise of the Greek Epic*, pp. 116-130, has shown how certain practices, familiar in Greece both in primitive and classical times, e.g., unnatural sexual connexions, desecration of the dead, and human sacrifice, have disappeared from the Homeric poems in their present form.

and was perhaps none the less faithful to its trust because it blamed itself for disobedience in such unsparing terms. Doubtless legislation was in front of public practice. It was not in front of public opinion. Jeremiah xxxiv. 8 ff. describes the release of slaves when Jerusalem was in her last agonies. Evidently the practice had not been a regular one, and the newly given freedom was almost immediately taken away; none the less the duty was there and was recognized. More than a century later, we find Nehemiah reaffirming the principle of release at the end of the seventh year (ch. x. 31) as well as of the weekly cessation on the Sabbath. In so distracted a condition as that of Palestine in the middle of the fifth century, such a task might well have seemed herculean, had it not been part of the Hebrew civic and moral consciousness.¹

Herein lies the greatest contrast between the Hebrew codes and the great code of Hammurabi. Both the parallels and the divergences between the laws of Babylon and Palestine have often been pointed out. In certain cases, the former are more humane, as they are certainly more modern. Society in Israel in the tenth century B.C. was far more primitive than society in Babylon in the twentieth. Cases are provided for by Hammurabi which never entered the mind of Hebrew legislators. The law of retaliation, which still holds good for patricians (*Amelu*), is expressly modified for plebeians (*Mushkenu*). Sexual crime was certainly treated with less harshness. Provisions for the protection of slaves were very elaborate; this was however chiefly owing

¹ The continuity observable in the social utterances of the prophets points to the same fact. They voiced an abiding sentiment and conviction. Had a year of release, however, been recognized in practice, we should have expected some reference to it in, e.g., Isaiah v., Micah ii. But cf. Jos. *Ant.*, *loc. cit.* Tacitus and Josephus both point to the observance of the seventh year of fallow; "blandiente inertia(!) septimum quoque annum ignaviae datum" (Tac. *Hist.* v. 4. 4; cf. Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 10. 6).

to their value as property. The same respect for property is seen in the elaborate provisions for the compensation for damage, more particularly in connexion with the complicated Babylonian irrigation system. The attention paid by Hammurabi's code to the relations of merchant and agent is of course unknown to the Hebrew codes ; and where opportunities for fraud on both sides were so numerous, we cannot but admire the zeal with which the legislator endeavoured to hold the balances evenly. What we miss is any suggestion that weakness and helplessness can convey a definite right to protection or care. Like the modern legislator, Hammurabi has to consider the needs of the whole community, the rights of property, the security of trade, the preservation of credit. That our modern law, at least in the last century, has gone farther, is due to the fact that the Hebrew law still exerts an influence impossible for the Babylonian. It cannot, indeed, be asserted that the most humane of our modern laws are due to the pure spirit of humanity evidenced in the Pentateuch. Factory legislation would never have been passed, if it had not been recognized as advantageous to the employer as well as the employed ; but it is a question whether even this recognition would have been sufficient to pass such laws, apart from the spirit of humanity and of that reverence for the weak, the helpless and unprotected, which modern society has learnt from the New Testament, and which the New Testament took over and developed from the Old.

The function of the Hebrew codes, however, has not been exhausted by the legislation of the last hundred years. It may be permitted to point out that their importance for the present day is more striking than ever before. The conditions of modern life are a hundred times more complicated than those out of which sprang the Deuteronomic Code or the denunciations of Isaiah or even Ezekiel. What is

needed to-day is the *ἐπιείκεια*, the readiness to take less than one's actual rights, on which the Pharisee Saul of Tarsus insisted (2 Cor. x. 1 ; Phil. iv. 5 ; comp. 1 Tim. iii. 3, Titus iii. 2), and whose importance was recognized by Aristotle a century after it began to drop out of recognition in the Priests' Code.¹ It sums up in one word the characteristics which underlay the twin appeals, for honesty and for kindness, in the Hebrew Law. Without this moral attitude, laws will labour in vain in pursuit of oppression and violence and fraud. The ingenuity which makes laws is after all only spasmodic ; the ingenuity which breaks or evades them is perennial. The fatherless and the widow, the unemployed and the sweated, can never be protected by enactments alone. Certain forms of oppression can be made impossible ; others will assuredly be invented. The socialistic régime equally with the individualistic may mean, for some, pure tyranny. The only safeguard is the diffusion of the spirit which loves one's neighbour as oneself, which is willing to consider the "stranger" as well as the home-born, and which, in fact, regards the members of one's community with precisely the same trust, kindness, forbearance, and open-handedness as the members of one's own family. It was the glory of the Hebrew Law to perceive this and to assert it unflinchingly. The Hebrew moral consciousness never learnt, indeed, to obliterate all distinctions between native and foreign,² and the truth underlying this distinction was never fully perceived. For that, the world had to wait for the New Testament. "One is your teacher, and all ye are brethren" (Matt. xxiii. 8) ; to do them justice, these words must be allowed the widest application. But the Hebrew legislators con-

¹ *Nic. Eth.* iv. 1, v. 10 ; it is the opposite of *φauλότης*, the mean and grasping character.

² See above, p. 455, and compare Exodus xxi. 2, Deuteronomy xv. 3, xx. 10 ff., etc. ; and, on the other hand, the passages quoted on p. 458.

stantly looked towards this principle, even though for them it lay beyond the horizon; and when the greatest of all the prophets appeared on the earth, He could say no more than that He had come "not to destroy the law, but to fulfil it."

W. F. LOFTHOUSE.

"*THAT FORM OF DOCTRINE*" : AN APPEAL.

WHAT does the phrase "form of doctrine" in Romans vi. 17 mean? "Doctrine," to our ears, suggests speculative theology; but it is incredible that in 58 A.D. there should have existed at the back of the minds of Christian people an ordered system of theology, to which St. Paul could make his appeal. The word *διδασκαλία* means, of course, simply "teaching": and the *τύπος διδασκαλίας* to which St. Paul says the Roman Christians stood committed (*εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε*) must mean the *body of moral teaching*, or, as we should say, the ethical standard in which the religion of Christ expressed itself in actual life. To one system of moral instruction, constituting one attitude to life, one way of living, Christian converts stood committed.

St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles tells us that, very early, Christians began to be spoken of as persons of *The Way*: they evidently were distinguished by being committed to a body of precepts or preferences which made up one recognizable method of life.

And evidently Christian catechumens were instructed in this body of precepts: the "Way of Life," as contrasted with the "Way of Death."¹ Happily we possess in the *Didaché* a specimen of this instruction, a textbook coming down to us from nearly the apostolic times. The book begins, "There are two ways—one of life, one of death; and there is much difference between them. The way of

¹ Cf. "The Way of Light and the Way of the Black One."—*Ep. Barn.*, 19, 20.

Life is this"—and thereupon follows a series of instructions not, as we should say, in the main doctrinal but ethical; moral precepts and prohibitions creating a definite moral atmosphere. It was to this, then—to a body of teaching which outlined a well-defined and consistent manner of living, living which, no doubt, included reverence and piety, but was not less clearly marked by a certain recognizable moral behaviour—to this the early Christian found himself committed.

Now to such a body of moral teaching, outlining a well-known manner of life, we who have been brought up in the atmosphere of Christian civilization still stand committed; and I suggest that this may reasonably be made the basis of an appeal in the interest of personal religion. Observe, it is not a body of dogma that is in our view; we may reject dogma yet be unable to escape from, nay, stand committed to a body of moral teaching, teaching that comes out in us not as opinion so much as in instinct, in moral axiom. Here are typical extracts from the *Didaché*: "Abstain from fleshly lusts. Thou shalt not be double-tongued nor covetous, nor a hypocrite, nor arrogant, nor a liar, nor vainglorious, nor evil-minded." Now these things we also *know*: we are committed to them. But then that fact is sometimes strangely made the reason for declining any connexion with organized religion. "We don't need to go to church, ma'am," said one of the London poor to a Queen's nurse, "we already *know* all we can practise in our dull life." "I do not need religion," says the cultured man of to-day; "for either the man in the pulpit, if he be in metaphysical vein, is talking of what he cannot prove, or, if he be moralizing, is simply labouring the obvious, giving many periphrases for the one refrain, "Be good, be good; and *I know that already*." Precisely: we know it already; to a certain outline of good living we find our-

selves handed over ; it is just that fact that, it seems to me, constitutes a valid appeal for personal religion.

1. For, first of all, ought not men to cultivate a sense of *debt* for this moral equipment ? They find themselves possessed not merely in a vague way of a conscience about wrongdoing, but of an organic body of conceptions regarding life and life's purpose and what ought to be done and what ought to be avoided ; and all this is tremendously and every day valuable. Surely men should realize that they did not create this bundle and treasure of truth about the right way to live ; it is not *theirs*.

The benefits of a complete, inelastic body of dogma may be doubtful in the last degree, but there can be no doubt of the immense benefit of the instinct of the true way of life. It has kept us in many an hour of temptation ; it has made a whole side of life which might have proved our ruin simply uninteresting to us. Whence has it come ? It is weak half-thinking to trace it to the society around and behind us, and to speak vaguely of development. Suppose that it came from God, from some supramundane fount of moral suggestion ? Then to God is gratitude due, and we are already committed to a rudimentary religion. And suppose that it has been specifically mediated through Jesus Christ ? (We are not pronouncing upon non-Christian ethical heritages, but thinking only of our own, which surely did receive a special cast and colour from Jesus Christ.) Then to Him our thought should turn—I do not say as yet in worship, but in grateful remembrance. And out of this root of admission of indebtedness, *and out of this alone*, springs the tree of personal religion.

2. But are we not forced further than this—from gratitude to reflection, from a rudimentary religion to a rudimentary theology ? A man is surely culpably thoughtless who never thinks back from his own moral equipment to

the character of its source. The gift of an ethical standard argues surely some kind of solicitude on the part of the Giver, that men shall make right choices. But if there exist over us such solicitude for us, should we pass it by without acknowledgment? Ought we not to turn over in our mind the great thought that God *may* be Love, until the truth that God *is* Love compels our acceptance and response?

And then does not this moral inheritance drive our thought and interest back on Jesus Christ? We may not be willing to acknowledge that that entire body of impulse proceeded from Him, but it is at least true that He has uniquely illustrated the life to which it moves. The impression of His life is that alone which fits the "mould" at every point. It is because of this unfailing moral accuracy of His that men have stood before Him in stunned amazement, in a wistful wonder that has passed into prayer for some share of His secret of the power rightly to live. We cannot surely, truly appreciate this moral treasure if we are not interested in Christ. It is indeed a marvellous thing that men reared in an even semi-Christianized civilization should not be interested in the one Person in history who successfully illustrates their moral ideals. The best spirits among the Jews and among the heathen put to shame such indifference; every candid and honest soul, *to whom unpaid debt is an abhorrence*, must deplore and be ashamed when a brother man is callously indifferent to the supreme illustration and the source, and the character of the source, of that which is the very best, unearned possession of his life.

3. Further, a due appreciation of our moral inheritance leads to religion when one is confronted with the responsibility of the *propagation* of this "body of teaching." If we find ourselves impelled in saving directions by a body of moral preferences and admirations confessedly not self-originated, and we see other men following different courses

and baser impulses, the very fact that our moral equipment is not self-produced binds upon us the obligation to interfere. *Laissez-faire* here is simply selfish cowardice. Well, but how long can a man take up seriously, as his concern, the moral condition of his time without the help of "religion"? For let him plunge seriously and earnestly into the great moral conflict around, and confront the multitudinous traffic in evil, and soon he will find himself face to face with two problems that drive directly toward religion. (1) the problem of some continual inspiration from within; (2) the problem of support and stimulus from without.

(1) Is it possible long to bear the contradiction of evil without falling back for renewed inspiration for the conflict to the Source or sources of good moral impulse? I venture to think, if we knew all, we should find that there is simply no exception to the law that sustained effort to inthrust the highest moral ideals into the lives of our fellows demands some such converse with the Fount of unselfish impulse as can be called prayer.

(2) Besides, a man is bound to find himself flung out upon the sympathy and encouragement of other workers in the field. The forces of evil are so organized that for those on the side of the good the problem of fellowship becomes very soon acute. But now these two drifts—the drift inward to the sources of unselfish impulse, and the drift outward upon the co-operation of others—these are the very winds that drive men most directly to the haven of personal and collective religion.

4. And then, lastly, there is the question of return to God. We find ourselves here with a heaven-born body of moral ideals dwelling in us. Were they realized around us, this world would be a veritable Heaven. The dream of that Heaven is in our hearts. And were the moral ideals realized in us, as they ought to be, we would ourselves be fit denizens

of that Heaven. All this points to the origin and issue of our life as being otherwise than here. And that answers to our instinct, the instinct which is so much earlier than the dogma of judgment. The moral ideals with which we find ourselves endowed will certainly be (if one may thus speak) gathered home; our failure to realize them will be investigated and judged. What then is to be our attitude to our failure to realize them?

In the Hamstead colliery a group of dying men had written around their names upon a wall, "Lord, preserve us; for we are trusting in Christ."

"Trusting in Christ," what does that stand for? Surely this: These men facing the onset of death felt with a shiver their personal unworthiness to stand before the Maker and Giver of their conscience. They felt they had not wholly obeyed the "body of teaching to which they had stood committed." But with comfort their eyes turned to the Christ who *had* fulfilled all righteousness. He at least had done well; perhaps His well-doing would atone for their failure. At least He stood for what they wished that they had been; what now they fain would be. And with that wistful gaze at His wholeness and beauty, they met death.

And the message has been of unspeakable comfort to those left behind; for whatever be our attitude to dogma, this is above all what we crave for our friends as they pass out into the night—that they should return to the Source of their moral life, to the Fount of the ideals that had made themselves known within them—return with contrition and mute appeal.

But this is precisely the evangelic attitude to Jesus. He stands for what we fain would be; and as the light fades from our eyes, we, knowing our failure, put our trust in His overflowing triumph and cast ourselves, in Him, on the mercy of God.

For the inheritor of the Christian moral tradition I cannot see that there is any other alternative than one of these two courses :

(1) Either, to receive and use, in utter ingratitude and selfish pride, this gift of a body of moral teaching, and end in being that most contemptible of human types, the sordidly upright, thankless, godless Pharisee ;

(2) Or, humbly recognizing the Divine origin of his moral quipment, and owning his debt both to God and to his brethren in their need, to seek, with others his fellows in moral aspiration and moral service, the face of that God as revealed in Jesus Christ, in contrition and surrender and the quest of inspiration, and with the homage of a grateful praise.

G. A. JOHNSTON ROSS.

OPERA FORIS.

MATERIALS FOR THE PREACHER.

V.

JOHN ii. 1-2. *And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee . . . and both Jesus was called, and his disciples to the marriage.*

Nathanael had been promised the vision of *greater things* in Jesus, and this opening scene of the ministry forms the first revelation of the new order which was being inaugurated. It was to be free from the narrow and arbitrary abstinence of asceticism. Unlike John the Baptist, Jesus took his disciples freely to a country wedding, as if to mark the genial spirit of his religion. The significance of the incident, in this aspect, does not need to be underlined. But it acquires additional and unsuspected emphasis if we connect it with the words immediately preceding it in the first chapter of the Gospel. There, as was suggested in an

earlier series of these notes, Nathanael seems to be regarded as a better Jacob, to whom, as "Israel" or "seeing God," a better union of the Divine Being is vouchsafed. *Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man.* The allusion is not to any appearances of angels but to the life of Christ on earth regarded as a continuous revelation and communication of God to men. "La vie de Jésus va être comme une continuelle révélation du ciel, un commerce pareil à celui que vit Jacob dans sa fameuse vision, où les anges allaient et venaient pour accomplir les ordres de Dieu. Ce commerce a été inauguré par l'incarnation du Verbe et la descente de l'Esprit ; il ne cessera plus désormais tant que durera sur la terre la manifestation du Christ. Les anges sont donc le symbole réel de l'assistance divine qui éclatera dans les miracles du Sauveur" (Loisy).

Now the interesting thing is that this Jacob, whose vision of God at Peniel is thus employed to figure forth the fuller revelation of the Son of man to Christians, was regarded by Philo as the typical ascetic. In some circles of Jewish Hellenism, ascetic discipline was held to be the supreme condition of beholding God. Anti-social rigour was the motto of the elect. The body had to be kept down, social ties broken, and all joys sternly crushed, if the soul was to attain the beatific vision of the things divine. Philo, who voices this feeling, displays real ingenuity in interpreting Jacob's life along this line. To him "Jacob," says Dr. M. Friedländer (in *Die religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu*, 1905, pp. 256 f.), "is the ascetic κατ' ἐξοχήν who has to fight hard against all that is earthly, in order to attain the vision of God." The stone on which he pillows his head at Peniel (Gen. xxviii. 11) represents the rigour of life which prepares one for the sight of God. So Philo argues (*de Somn.* i. 446), if the ascetic is eager

in the practice of this discipline, then, instead of being called Jacob the supplanter, he will be hailed as Israel *ὁ θεὸν ὁρῶν*.

This association of Jacob's vision with asceticism would obviously lend point to the promise of Jesus in John i. 51 as well as to his action in ii. 2 f. The conditions of beholding God's glory were no longer to be considered as implying a strict, unsocial asceticism, which was possible only to an élite of distinguished pietists or recluses like the Therapeutæ. To all true disciples Jesus revealed God upon earth in his own person, and the revelation led them not away from but into the simple and natural life of men. However much self-denial and strictness and discomfort his calling involved, whatever special sacrifices might be demanded of individuals for special ends, Jesus refused to bind any false asceticism as a yoke upon his followers. He declined to identify purity of heart with mortification of the flesh. The ascetism which came naturally in the line of Christian service and self-control was one thing. But asceticism for its own sake, the contempt felt for the body and for the body's desires as if these must be a standing hindrance to the vision of faith, this was an anti-social and a misdirected aim, with which the Son of man had no sympathy himself and desired his disciples to have none. The first of the *greater things* which dawned on Nathanael and the erstwhile disciples of the Baptist was the presence of the Son of Man at a wedding-feast.

* * * * *

Heb. vi. 4-5 :—*Those who have tasted of the heavenly gift . . . and the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come.*

The *heavenly gift* is God's loving forgiveness of sins, the supreme boon of the Christian dispensation, in which all believers participate. The *good word of God* means the sure, kind promises made by Him to human faith for the

future, and this is bound up with the experience, here and now, of *the powers of the world to come* which are already operating within the present age. Such a description of the normal Christian experience of God's Spirit is intelligible enough in the first century, when the strong eschatological hope of Christendom still throbbed within the churches. But is the latter a reasonable element for ourselves? Is this "l'avant-goût de l'éternité," as Reuss calls it, this ardent eschatological expectation possible and desirable still? Cannot the taste of forgiveness which restores us to our place with God suffice by itself, without the other taste? Does not the modern outlook on the world compel us to drop the forward anticipation and to content ourselves with the present assurance of a heavenly Father's love such as Jesus taught? Instead of looking for a new heaven and earth, why should we not be satisfied with a God who has numbered the very hairs of our head? Would not this be at once more spiritual and more consonant with that view of the universe which we are bidden accept from modern science?

Dr. Kölbing, the distinguished Moravian scholar, raises this crucial question in a recent pamphlet on *Die bleibende Bedeutung der urchristlichen Eschatologie* (Göttingen, 1907, pp. 25 f.), and seeks to answer it in the negative. Whatever details of the primitive eschatology have a merely temporary value, he does not believe that we are obliged to curtail this description of the Christian position, as if "eschatological faith, in the strict sense of the term, were merely the expression of a specifically Jewish and antiquated view of the universe." His reasons are as follow.¹

He begins by pointing out that, wherever the apocalyptic

¹ For a persuasive statement on the same lines, but with greater breadth, see Mr. Scott Lidgett's volume on *The Christian Religion* (1907), pp. 467 f.

ideas of primitive Christianity may have been quarried, the religious source of its eschatology lay, as it still lies, in the sure knowledge of God's fatherly love to men which Jesus brought into the world. He then points out that this forward look of faith is justified for ourselves to-day by the believing man's experience of the world as a hindrance to the full development of spiritual life. "In the light of the knowledge of God which Jesus has conferred on men, the Christian must ever and anon have the feeling that this earthly world has a variety of ways in which it can hinder any one who lies within its sphere from entering into fellowship with the Father in heaven." The Christian can indeed experience the supernatural reality of God, but it is an experience which is exposed to thwarting doubts and recurring obstacles. The witness of history and the record of the church are enough to prove this up to the hilt. Furthermore, as "the Christian recognizes that the dominating element in the spiritual life of Him who is Lord of the world is His holy and fatherly love," he must also admit the conscious and unconscious opposition to God's moral will which starts up in society and in the individual. The progress of God's good reign is slow, and the actual facts seem often to contradict the idea of His royal love. "Few are chosen," and even the few meet difficulties of all sorts in the practice of their fellowship with God. What can justify the Christian's confidence, as he faces such untoward facts, and "overcomes the world," but the glad certainty, now as in the primitive days of Christianity, that a new world of unclouded vision and unhindered service awaits God's children? This certainty of hope, with its perspective of the future, Dr. Kölbing argues, springs always from the faith of Jesus. It enables the weak and sinful here to glory already in the coming bliss, since such people know that God's forgiving and

controlling grace can enable them, even through the trials and evil of the present, to inherit the world to come. "If this is so, then we must decide that *to taste the powers of the world to come* is an element essential to the moral and religious faith of Christianity in God's holy love to sinful men. In other words, the eschatological character of primitive Christian faith is not a merely adventitious and transient element which was due to the Jewish view of the world; it possesses a permanent significance for the religious life of the Christian church." On this view, those who *taste the heavenly gift* of God's forgiveness do so, in the fullest sense, as they also *taste the good word* of God's promise for the future and *the powers of the world to come*, since the experience of forgiveness involves a reach and a range of faith in God's holy purpose which extend beyond the limits of a world-order where His power and love cannot fully come into play. The present experience thus stands in a vital relationship to the future hope.

The stars come nightly to the sky,
The tidal wave unto the sea,
Nor time, nor space, nor deep, nor high,
Can keep my own away from me.

And part of this *own* possession is the future. The present experience of the Spirit, with its assurance of divine forgiveness and fellowship, not only transmutes the trials of to-day into opportunities of moral growth for the life of God, but provides a foretaste of that new order which will correspond, as this world cannot, with the just requirements of the believing soul.

JAMES MOFFATT.

AN ARAMAIC INSCRIPTION FROM SYRIA.

M. POGNON, French Consul at Aleppo, has just published the second part of his *Inscriptions Sémitiques de la Syrie, de la Mésopotamie, et de la région de Mossoul* (80 francs), of which the first part appeared last year. Most of the inscriptions are Syriac of the first century A.D. and later : but the volume which appeared last year contained an interesting cuneiform inscription of Nabonidus, found at Eski-Harran, a village a few miles north-east of the ancient Haran; and the present volume contains (pp. 156 ff.) an Aramaic inscription (No. 86), which mentions Hazael and the second Ben-hadad of the Old Testament (2 Kings xiii. 3, 25), found at a village which, for prudential reasons, M. Pognon does not name. It is of this Aramaic inscription that I propose to give a short account in the present article. It is inscribed on the front and left side of a monolith, now broken into four blocks, about 2 ft. broad and 1 ft. deep at the base, and, in its present condition, about 3 ft. 6 in. high. The *stelè* must, however, originally have been 6 or 7 ft. high ; for its upper part is at present missing, and the inscription begins below a figure, carved in bas-relief upon the stone, of which only the lower part of the robe and the feet still remain. The inscription on the front of the *stelè* consists of seventeen lines of about thirty-two letters each ; the one on the left side consists of twenty-eight lines of about fourteen letters each ; when the *stelè* was complete there were probably some thirty additional lines on the upper part of this side ; there is also an independent short inscription on the right side of the *stelè*. The words are separated from each other by thin vertical lines, which,

however, have in some cases been omitted, or once, in I. 9 after the ת in מחנתהם, misplaced by the engraver.

The following is the Aramaic text of the inscription, as read by M. Pognon, transcribed into square Hebrew characters; in several places, it will be seen, there are passages which are illegible. The general sense is, however, clear. Zakir, the king of Hamath and La'ash, erects the *stèle* with the inscription in order to declare how his god, Baal-shamain, the Baal of heaven, had helped him against his foes. Bar-hadad (Heb. Ben-hadad), son of Hazael, king of Aram (Syria), had gathered round him a number of allies, and laid siege to Hazrak, a fortified city, it may be inferred, in Zakir's domain. He had appealed to Baal-shamain for help; and his god had answered him, and encouraged him with promises of assistance and deliverance. The imperfect lines at the beginning of col. ii. seem to have told of his successes against the besiegers of Hazrak, and of the temples and other buildings which he had erected in his land after the repulse of his foes. The inscription ends, as ancient inscriptions often do, with an imprecation against any one who injures it or removes it from its place.

I.

י[נ]צבא זי שם זכר מלך [ח]מת ולעש לאלור [י]ומא [ח]נה זכר מלך
 חמת ולעש אש ענה אנה ו י[נ]י בעלשמין וקם עמי וחמלכני
 בעלשמ[י]ן ' זהך ואוחד עלי ברהדד בר חזאל
 מלך ארם ש עשר מלכ ברהדד ומחנתה וברגש ומחנתה
 ו[מ]ילד[ך] קוה ומחנתה ומלך עמק ומחנתה ומלך גרג[ם] [ו]מח[נ]תה
 ומלך שמאל ומ[ח]נתה ומלך מלז[ו] (?) [ומ]ח[נ]תה *
 ש[ו]בעת מלכ[ו]ן [י]המ[ו] ומחנתהם ושמו כל
 מלכיא אל מצר על חז[ו]רד[ך] ¹⁰ [ו]הרמו שר מן שר חז[ו]רד[ך] והעמקו חרץ
 מן חרצה ¹¹ [ו]אשא ידי אל בעלשמ[י]ן ויעגני בעלשמ[י]ן
¹² בעלשמין אלי [ב]יד חזין וביד עדדן [י]ואמר [י]אלי בעלשמין
 אל תזחל כי אנה המל[כ]תך ואנה אק[ם] עמך ואנה אחצלך מן כל
 [י]מלכיא אל זי ¹³ מחאו עליך מצר ויאמר ל ¹⁴ [כ]ל
 מלכיא אל זי מחאו על[ך] [מצר] ¹⁷ ושורא
 זנה ז

II.

¹ . . . חז[רד] ק . . . לרכב [ו]לפרש * . . . מלכה בנה
 אני[ה] . . . ת חזרד והוספ[ית לה] אית כל מחנת * . . . א ושמתה
 מל[כא] * . . . תה א . . . סניא אל בכל נף * בנית בתי
 אלהן בכל[ל] ¹⁰ . . . י ובנית אית . . . ¹¹ . . . [א]ית אפשו . . . ¹² . . .
 יא בית . . . ¹³ . . . [ו]שמת קחם אל[יור] נצבא זנה וכ[תב"ת]ה
 אית אשר ידי ¹⁴ [מ]ן יהגע אית א[שר] ¹⁵ [ידי] זכר מלך חמ[ת] ול[י]עש
 מן נצבא זנה ו[מן] ¹⁶ יהגע נצבא זנה מן [קיד]ם אלור ויהנסנה
 [מן] ¹⁷ [אש]רה או מן ישלח ב . . . ¹⁸ . . . ת[ה] . . .
 . . . [בע]לשמים וא[ל]יור . . . ושמש ושהר * . . .
 ואל[ה]י שמינן * ואלהי ארק ובעלע * . . . אשא ואית . . .
 . . . ש . . . ש . . .

III.

. שם זכר ושם

In the translation which follows the mark of interrogation indicates a word or passage of which the meaning or reading is uncertain.

I.

(*Front of Stelè.*)

¹ The *stelè* which Zakir, king of Hamath and La'ash, set up to Alur. ² [This day ?] I, Zakir, king of Hamath and La'ash, . . . ? . . . and Baal-shamain [Baal of heaven] . . . ³ me, and stood with me; and Baal-shamain made me king . . . ⁴ . . . Bar-hadad, son of Hazael, king of Aram, assembled (?) and united against me . . . ⁵-teen kings; Bar-hadad and his army [*lit.* camp], Bar-gash and his army, the king ⁶ of Kaweh and his army, the king of 'Amk and his army, the king of Gurgum ⁷ and his army, the king of Sam'al and his army, the king of Malaz and his army: ⁸ . . . seven[-teen kings] ⁹ were they with their armies. And all these kings laid siege against Haz[rach]; ¹⁰ and they raised up a wall higher than the wall of Hazrach, and made a trench deeper than its trench. ¹¹ And I lifted up my hands unto Baal-shamain, and Baal-shamain answered me. ¹² [And] Baal-shamain [sent or spake] unto me by the hand of seers and by the hand of . . . ? . . . ;

[and] Baal-shamain [said ¹³ unto me,] Fear not; for *I* have made thee k[ing, and *I* will ¹⁴ stan]d with thee, and *I* will deliver thee from all [these kings who] ¹⁵ have driven siege-works against thee. And he said to . . . ¹⁶ all these kings who have driven [siege-works] . . . ¹⁷ . . . and this wall wh[ich] . . .

II.

(On the left-hand side of the Stelè.)

¹ . . . Hazrach . . . ² . . . to the chariots and horsemen . . . ³ his (*or* its) king within it . . . *I* ⁴ have . . . Hazrach, and have added ⁵ [to it] all the territory (?) of . . . ⁶ to . . .; and *I* made him king ⁷ . . . ⁸ . . . these enemies on all sides. ⁹ *I* built houses (i.e. temples) of gods in all ¹⁰ my . . . And *I* built . . . ¹¹ . . . ? . . . and . . . ¹² . . . the house (temple) . . . ¹³ . . . And *I* set up be[fore Al-¹⁴ur] this *stelè*; and *I* wrote (on) ¹⁵ it the . . . ? . . . of my hands. ¹⁶ Whosoever shall remove (?) the . . . ? . . . of [the hands of] Zakir, king of Hamath and ¹⁸ La'ash from this *stelè*, and whosoever ¹⁹ shall remove (?) this *stelè* from be²⁰fore Alur, and destroy (?) it from ²¹ its [pla]ce, or whosoever shall send away . . . ²² . . . ? . . . ²³ . . . [Ba]l-shamain, and A[l²⁴ur] . . . and Shamash, and Sahar, ²⁵ . . . and the gods of heaven ²⁶ and the gods of earth, and Baal 'A . . . ²⁷ . . . , and . . . ²⁸ . . .

III.

(On the right-hand side of the Stelè.)

¹ . . . ² the name of Zakir, and the name of . . .

The inscription, both by its contents and by the peculiar type of Aramaic in which it is written, takes us into the same region as Zenjirli, about seventy miles north of Aleppo, and Nêrab, a few miles south-east of Aleppo, from both of which places some very interesting inscriptions, dating from the eighth century B.C., and written in Aramaic

of the same character, were found in 1891 (see text, translations, and notes in G. A. Cooke's *North-Semitic Inscriptions*, 1903, pp. 159-91; extracts, also, in the essay by the present writer, on archaeology as illustrating the Old Testament, in Hogarth's *Authority and Archaeology*, pp. 131-3). The Aramaic-speaking people in all this region evidently at this time used the same dialect, worshipped largely the same deities,—some Assyrian, some not otherwise known,—and had the same civilization. The date of the inscription must be about B.C. 800 *: it is consequently the oldest Aramaic inscription at present known, and only about fifty years later than the inscription of Mesha on the "Moabite Stone."

I append a few notes which may help to explain or illustrate the inscription; for the historical and geographical particulars I am largely indebted to M. Pognon, to whose full and lucid expositions I must refer those desirous of further details.

I. ¹ *The stelè which . . . set up.* Cf. l. 1 of Bar-rekub's inscription (Cooke, *North-Semitic Inscriptions*, 62. 1).

Zakir. So vocalized by M. Pognon, because the name is thus found in Assyrian inscriptions.

Hamath. Of course, well known from the O.T. On the Orontes, about 110 miles north of Damascus, and eighty miles south of both Aleppo and Antioch.

La'ash. Not otherwise known; from the context, it cannot have been far from Hamath.

Alur. A deity mentioned here for the first time.

* The restoration 'this day' is very uncertain, the form נַיִן being also questionable. Mr. Pognon's rendering of the words represented in the English by a ? is not satis-

* Hazael, Bar-hadad's father, is known to have been reigning in the eighteenth year of Shalmaneser II (= 842 B.C.)—the same year in which Shalmaneser received the "tribute of Jehu" (see *K.B.* i. 1, p. 141; or *Authority and Archaeology*, p. 95).

factory ; and the photograph of the inscription is not distinct enough to enable the correctness of the reading to be tested. *Baal-shamain*. “Baal of heaven” is constantly mentioned in Phoen. and Aram. inscriptions : see Cooke, *op. cit.*, p. 45. Zakir speaks of “Baal of heaven” as having given him his throne.

³ *Stood with me*. So in Panammu’s inscription (*ib.* 61. (2, 3).

⁴ *Bar-hadad*. The *Ben-hadad* (II), son of Hazael, of 2 Kings xiii. 3, 25. The Aram. “*Bar-hadad*” is in the O.T. Hebraized into “*Ben-hadad*”; in the Pesh. the Aramaic form is used. Hadad was one of the principal Aramaean deities—probably a storm-god ; Panammu (*ib.* 61) places him at the head of the gods whom he names and attributes all his successes to him.

⁵ [. . .] *teen kings*. One is reminded of the thirty-two kings who accompanied the first Ben-hadad on his expedition against Samaria (1 Kings xx. 1, 16).

Bar-gash. “Gash” is presumably the name of a divinity. M. Pognon asks whether גרנש should not be read for גרנש on the seal, *C.I.S.* II. i. 105.

⁶ *Kaweh*. A *Kawi* is mentioned by Shalmaneser II as twice invaded by him, after crossing the Amanus-range (*K. B.* i. 1, 141, l. 101 ; 145, l. 132 f.), and consequently in Cilicia. Though 140–150 miles north of Hamath, it is doubtless the place here meant ; for other places in the same neighbourhood are mentioned immediately afterwards.

Amk. Still, says M. Pognon, el-’Amk, a low and marshy tract, south and south-east of the Lake of Antioch, a few miles north-east of the town. See the map at the end of Sachau’s *Reise in Syrien und Mesopotamien* (1883), where it is marked.

Gurgum. Mentioned in Bar-rekub’s inscription (Cooke, 62. 15), and also by Shalmaneser II (*K.B.* i. 156, 172). It

must have been somewhere in the Amanus district; see Mr. Cooke's note, p. 179, and the map at the end of *KAT.*³, where it is marked on the north of Zenjirli and Sam'al.

Sam'al. Bar-rekub, in one of the inscriptions found at Zenjirli, styles himself "king of Sam'al" (Cooke, 63. 2); it was thus no doubt the country about Zenjirli. It is also mentioned by several of the Assyrian kings, in connexions pointing to the same region (see the note *ibid.*, p. 182; and the map just referred to). Of Malaz nothing is known.

𐤌𐤍𐤕 *they*. As in Egyptian Aramaic (Cooke, 76 B 4, and the papyri edited by Sayce and Cowley), and in the Aramaic of Ezra (in Daniel the form used is 𐤌𐤍𐤕).

𐤌𐤍 *these* (so ii. 12). As Ezr. v. 15 Qrê. In Nabataean, Cappadocian, and Egyptian Aramaic, and in Jer. .x. 11 the form used is 𐤌𐤍 (see *Oxf. Heb. Lex.*, p. 1080).

Hazrach. Apparently a fortified city belonging to Zakir. Is Hazrach, M. Pognon asks, rather than *Hatarikka* (Delitzsch, *Paradies*, p. 279; *DB.*, or *EB.*, s.v. *Hadrach*), the *Hadrach* (𐤇𐤕𐤕𐤏) of Zech. ix. 1?

¹¹ *And I lifted up my hands unto . . . and . . . answered me.* Both thoroughly Biblical expressions, the words, even to the "waw consecutive," being actually the same: see Ps. xxviii. 2, and Ps. iii. 4 Heb., cxx. 1. This is the first time that the "waw consecutive" (though used in Moabitish) has been found in Aramaic; but the Aramaic of this district was known before, from the inscriptions found at Zenjirli and Nêrab, to be curiously coloured with words and forms otherwise characteristic of Hebrew (see below). There is another instance of the waw consecutive in 𐤌𐤍𐤕, "and he said," in l. 15 (and doubtless also in l. 13). The perfect with the simple waw is, however, more commonly used in the inscription.

¹² *by the hand of seers.* It is interesting to find that there were "seers" in Hamath as well as in Israel. The word

is the same (except in form) as that used in Hebrew : Isa. xxix. 10, xxx. 10 ; Amos vii. 12, etc.

עֲדָן. A word of unknown meaning. An error for עֲדָן ("by the hand of *helpers*")—ד and נ being almost as similar in the old characters as in the square characters—might be thought of : but some more distinctive term would rather be expected.

¹³ נָל *not* (μή). So in Panammu's inscription (Cooke, 62. 22, 23, 29), and thrice in Daniel. Common in Hebrew, but not used in ordinary Aramaic.

Fear not. נָל, corresponding to the ordinary Aram. נָל : the *d* of ordinary Aramaic becoming in this dialect (as in Hebrew) *z* (so *zi*, "which," for "*di*," etc. : see Cooke, p. 185). So once in Hebrew, Job xxxii. 6. The usual Hebrew for "fear" is a different word altogether (פָּחַד).

¹⁴ *deliver.* נָל—apparently the same as the Hebrew נָל (Ps. l. 15, lxxxi. 7 [Heb. 8], etc.), and perhaps an error of the stone-cutter for נָל. This root is not, however, known to occur in other Aramaic with the meaning "deliver."

¹⁵ מָחָא. In Syr. מָחָא is *to strike* : in Hebrew the word (with the מ consonantal as here) occurs three times of striking (i.e. clapping) the hands (Ezek. xxv. 6 ; Isa. lv. 12 ; Ps. xcvi. 8). מָצָר can hardly be anything but the Hebrew מָצוֹר *circumvallation, siege-works* : so the use of מָחָא with this is peculiar. M. Pognon compares the Syr. phrase מָחָא קָרְבָּא, "*bellum intulit.*"

וִיאָמַר. With *waw* consecutive, exactly as in Hebrew.

ii. 5, אִית. The mark of the accus., spell as in Phoenician. In Hebrew אִת ; in ordinary Aramaic (very rare in Syriac) אִת. So ll. 10, 11, 15, etc.

⁸ גַּף (גַּף). *Wing, fig. side* ; cf. in Palest. Syriac, Payne Smith, *Thes. Syr.* col. 764.

¹⁶ הָנַע. A word recurring in l. 19, but otherwise unknown.

²⁰ הָנַס. So in the Aramaic of Nêrab (Cooke, 64.5, followed,

as here, by "from its place" ; 65. 8, 9) ; but not otherwise known.

²¹ אַר[ש]. As *ibid.*, 64. 8. In ordinary Aramaic, "place" is אַר ; for the ש, see Cooke, p. 185.

²⁴ *Shamash*. The sun-god, mentioned also in the inscriptions of Zenjirli and Nêrab (*ibid.*, 61. 2, 3, etc. ; 62. 22 ; 64. 9).

Sahar. The moon-god (in the Aram. of the Targums, and in Syriac, ܫܕܪ means the moon ; cf. in Hebrew *sahārôn*, moon-shaped ornament, crescent, Judges viii. 21, 26 ; Isa. iii. 18), mentioned also in the two Nêrab inscriptions, *ibid.*, 64. 9 (beside Shamash), 65. 9, which are themselves sepulchral inscriptions of two priests of Sahar (64. 1 f., 65. 1). In Assyrian the name of the moon-god was *Sin* (in "Sennacherib," i.e. *Sin-ahê-erib*, "Sin has increased the brothers," and in all probability in "Sinai." Sin was largely worshipped by the Assyrians ; and especially, among other places, at Haran, where he was called *Bel Harrân*, "lord of Haran" (cf. "My lord Baal-haran" on a bas-relief of Bar-rekub in the Berlin Museum, Lidzbarski, *Nord-Sem. Epigraphik*, p. 444) : from Haran his worship may have been introduced into Zenjirli, Nêrab, and Hamath (cf. Cooke, pp. 187, 188). No doubt the illegible parts of ll. 22-27 contained words stating what the gods named were desired to do to any one who injured or removed the *stelè* : cf. Cooke, 64. 5-10, "Whosoever thou art that shalt remove (?) this image and couch (sarcophagus) from its place, may Sahar and Shamash and Nikal and Nusk pluck thy name and thy place out of life, and kill thee with the death of one worthy of effacement,* and cause thy seed to perish."

²⁶ אַר. In ordinary Aramaic אַר. The same form is, however, found in several other Aramaic dialects, and in

* Nöldeke, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, 1908, p. 205,—at least with a ?

the Aramaic verse Jeremiah x. 11 : see *Oxf. Heb. Lex.*, p. 1083; and, on the phonetic equation which the variation implies, Cooke, p. 185 (where other examples are quoted).

The Hebraizing features in the inscription are מַחֲצֵת (a *feminine* form, not as in Hebrew a *masculine*), *camp, host*, I. 5-8 (so Cooke, 62. 13, 16, 17; in ordinary Aramaic מַשְׁרִיתָא); מִצָּר, *circumvallation*, II. 9, 15; חָרַץ, *trench*, I. 10 (Dan. ix. 25); נָשָׂא, *to lift up*, I. 11; אֵל, *to*, I. 12; אֵל, *not*, I. 13; כִּי, *for*, I. 13; הִצִּיל, *deliver*, I. 14; the *sh* for *th* in אֶשְׁ[רָה], II. 21; and the *waw* consecutive.

M. Pognon hopes at some future time to be able to discover the rest of the *stelè*; and hence the reason why he will not state where the part which he has found is. He gives (Preface to Part i.) a lamentable picture of the ignorance of the natives. The Arab and Kurd peasants believe that stones with inscriptions contain gold, or at least that the inscriptions state where treasures are concealed; so they break in pieces any inscription in which they see a stranger to be interested. In 1899 M. Pognon took squeezes of some beautiful Hittite inscriptions near a village on the Euphrates; when he revisited the spot a few years afterwards he found the inscriptions all destroyed. At Eski-harran it was believed that inscriptions were deeds giving Europeans a title to property in Syria, which it was feared they would come and claim; so another excuse was found for destroying them. The country about Zenjirli abounds in mounds promising much to the excavator; and systematic exploration would certainly bring to light more Aramaic inscriptions of the same interesting kind as those which have been already discovered: it is thus earnestly to be wished that such exploration could be speedily resumed.

S. R. DRIVER.

ST. PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

(A STUDY OF 1 CORINTHIANS XV.)

III (*continued*).

IN the former part of this study of 1 Corinthians xv. we reached the conclusion that the "sowing" of vv. 36, 37 is not intended to illustrate burial or the act of sepulture. We ask, then, what is the significance of the image? What does St. Paul mean in this context to illustrate by the sowing of the seed? *When* is sown that human seed for whose quickening we must look beyond the passage of death? To the question as thus stated, the answer is plain enough. It is sown at our birth; the sowing of the seed represents the beginning, not the end, of earthly life. "That which thou sowest is not that body that shall be," for the fruit is unlike the seed, and the seed must pass through the transformation of death before it can be quickened into the new life of the harvest. And thus to describe the "sowing," and the characteristics of this human "seed," St. Paul falls back upon the imagery and the language of the earliest chapters of Genesis, where the story of the Creation of man is told. He has already spoken of Christ as the "First-fruits" (v. 23); but he now develops and explains this thought of the harvest, by recalling the conditions under which the seed of humanity was first sown in Adam. The key to the phraseology of vv. 38 ff. is the phraseology of the first chapter of Genesis.

There are many kinds of "seed" (v. 37), and God gives to each a "body" as it pleased Him (v. 38); that is, as it pleased Him at the epoch of Creation, the aorist *ἠθέλησεν* marking a definite moment in the past. There are thus

many kinds of "flesh," of beasts and of birds and of fishes and of men (v. 39; cf. Gen. i. 20-26). There are also "heavenly bodies" differing in glory from the "bodies of earth," and from each other, that is, the sun, moon, and stars, thus separately created at the first (vv. 40, 41).¹ Observe that this distinction between σώματα ἐπουράνια and σώματα ἐπίγεια is not parallel to the distinction between σώματα πνευματικά and σώματα ψυχικά of v. 44; we have not as yet come to that, and so far the writer is only amplifying his conception of the original diversities of creation, as set forth in Genesis i. In every case, the growth of nature, he suggests, is like the growth of a seed, which goes on to perfection, but which does not receive its full perfection at the first; the fruit is not the same as the seed, although it springs from it, and there is a diversity of fruit in correspondence with a variety of seed. This, it may be noticed, is substantially the same conception of the natural order that is found in the Apocalypse of Ezra (2 Esdras). The law of growth is set forth in 2 Esdr. v. 44, "The creature may not haste above the Creator; neither may the world hold them at once that shall be created therein." "So have I given the womb of the earth to those that be sown therein in their several times" (2 Esdr. v. 48). Of the seeds thus sown some are lost: "As the husbandman soweth much seed upon the ground, and planteth many trees, and yet not all that is sown shall come up in due season, neither shall all that is planted take root; even so they that are sown in the world shall not all be saved" (2 Esdr. viii. 41). All natural life, in short, including the life of man, is comparable to the growth of a seedling; and of that growth we know that the supreme law is, "that which thou sowest is not quickened—does not

¹ A close verbal parallel (although no more) is found in the dialogue *Epinomis* ascribed to Plato (p. 986) μία μὲν δύναμις ἡλίου μία δὲ σελήνης· μία δὲ τῶν πάντων ἀστρῶν κ.τ.λ. For once, Wetstein has not noticed this illustration of the text.

reach its highest—except it die.” “Thou shalt mortify it as Thy creature and quicken it as Thy work” (2 Esdr. viii.13).

Here, cries the Apostle, is the hope of Resurrection for man : “so also is the Resurrection of the dead” (v. 42).

(a) The seed of human faculty is “sown in corruption, raised in incorruption” (v. 42). In St. Paul’s phraseology the “bondage of corruption” (Rom. viii. 21) is the bondage of the earthly life, and at vv. 50, 52 of the present chapter he shows that he looks upon the living body of man as a “corruptible vessel” (cf. 2 Esdr. vii. [88]). When he speaks of the seed being sown ἐν φθορᾷ there is no thought of the dead body mouldering in the grave ; that, it must again be repeated, is alien to the context and to the argument. But the perishable living body is, as it were, the soil in which the seed of human faculty is sown and in which it strives to grow during the earthly life. From this bondage it is liberated by Death the great Emancipator, and, dying, it is quickened for the ampler life beyond. “It is raised in incorruption”; henceforth it will live and bear fruit in a freer and more stimulating environment. For, as the writer of the Book of Wisdom puts it, “God created man for incorruption” (Wisd. ii. 23). This is the “Redemption of the Body” (Rom. viii. 23) which Paul elsewhere calls our “adoption.”¹

(b) Again it is sown in dishonour, it is raised “in glory.” “Passions of dishonour,” πάθη ἀτιμίας (Rom. i. 26) is Paul’s description of bodily lusts ; from these, no less than from the “bondage of corruption,” the Christian hopes to be delivered when he shall have reached “the liberty of the glory of the children of God” (Rom. viii. 21). The seed is tainted with sin. “A grain of evil seed was sown in the

¹ Cf. also 2 Esdras vii. [96], where it is said of the blessed dead that “they have now escaped from that which is corruptible,” and of the future state that in it “corruption is passed away.” v. [113].

heart of Adam from the beginning" (2 Esdr. iv. 30). But from such dishonouring association the true seed shall be liberated at the Resurrection hereafter; it "shall be raised in glory."

(c) He goes on with his great Hymn of Hope. "It is sown in weakness; it is raised in power" (v. 43). The weakness of flesh (Rom. vi. 19; Gal. iv. 13), and the weakness of spirit, the want of faith (Rom. iv. 19, viii. 26, xiv. 1) which are inevitable conditions of the earthly life, are often before the mind of Paul; but he consoles himself with the thought that "Power is being perfected in weakness" (*ἡ γὰρ δύναμις ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελεῖται*, 2 Cor. xii. 9). So here, he expresses the conviction that the seed which in this world struggles weakly for its life, shall live anew, strong and vigorous, when it has been quickened through the passage of death.

(d) We reach the climax of this chant of victorious progress, the most illuminating statement of the antithesis between the earthly and the heavenly life in v. 44. "It is sown a psychical body; it is raised a spiritual body" (*σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν*, v. 44). The former clause of this statement, at least, is based on the express language of Genesis ii. 7, of which indeed it is a paraphrase.¹ "Man became a living soul." The creation of Adam is described by the words *ἐγένετο εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν*, which Paul quotes here (v. 45) and the same may be said of the birth of every son of Adam. At birth he becomes a "living soul"; he enters into a psychical stage of being; he inherits a "psychical body," weak and corruptible, charged with the poison of death, for "in Adam all die"

¹ The LXX has: *ἐνεφύσησεν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοήν ζωῆς καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν*. It is remarkable that Philo quotes this, at least once, with *πνεῦμα* for *πνοήν* (*Quod det. pot. ins.*, 22), and that he adds *πνεῦμα ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχῆς οὐσία*.

(v. 22). So much every Jew had learnt from the Old Testament. But the second part of the thesis is not a Jewish tenet; it is disclosed by the Christian revelation. As Paul had said at v. 22 that "in Christ shall all be quickened," so he repeats now: "The last Adam became a quickening spirit." The antithesis between the "first" and the "last" Adam is not a mere temporal antithesis, for ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδάμ means the Final Man, the Man beyond whom there can be no further progress. It is He who is a Quickening Spirit, although how this can be is not fully explained by the apostle. But it is clear that to appreciate his meaning in any degree, we must examine the relations between the σῶμα ψυχικόν, the fit organ and instrument of the ψυχή, and the σῶμα πνευματικόν, the fit organ and instrument of the πνεῦμα. And thus we must digress for the moment into psychology and ask what St. Paul thought of the relations between σὰρξ, σῶμα, ψυχή, πνεῦμα.

IV.

In St. Paul's language, the terms "spirit" (πνεῦμα) and "flesh" (σὰρξ) stand over against each other, the former standing for that which is highest, the latter for that which is lowest, in man. This is the starting-point of his psychology. The word ψυχή is sometimes used by him in the sense of "individual," much as we use the word "soul" (cf. "Every soul of man that worketh evil," Rom. ii. 9; "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers," Rom. xiii. 1); and it is sometimes used as equivalent to bodily "life," e.g., Romans xvi. 4; Phil. ii. 30; 1 Thess. ii. 8. But by St. Paul ψυχή is *never* used as the equivalent of πνεῦμα, although by the other New Testament writers the distinction between the two terms does not seem to be observed with any precision.¹ With him ψυχή never stands for the highest

¹ Cf. Charles, *Eschatology*, pp. 406 f., who has worked this out fully. See Luke i. 47.

faculty in man ; it is rather the " life " of man in its non-moral aspect, that is, the life of the flesh. The first man, at the Creation, and every son of man, at his birth, is made a " living soul." This *ψυχή* is exhibited in and through the *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, which is its vehicle and the theatre, so to speak, of its activities. The *σῶμα ψυχικόν* is the body of earth, with all its acquired habits and aptitudes and powers, which are largely due to the activity of the *ψυχή* and the direction taken by its energies :

For of the soule the bodie forme doth take ;
For soule is forme, and doth the bodie make.¹

This *σῶμα ψυχικόν* is in continual process of decay ; its destiny is death, for it is the theatre of sin. But, nevertheless, it is the Temple of the Spirit of God : *τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐστίν, οὗ ἔχετε ἀπὸ θεοῦ* (1 Cor. vi. 19). This is what distinguishes man from the lower creatures. As in their case, his *ψυχή* animates the *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, but it is not his sole energetic faculty, or his highest. For he is made in the Divine Image in respect of his *πνεῦμα*, his spirit, that in him which is Divine. Between this and the *σὰρξ* there is a perpetual warfare ; and the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* is for it an unworthy and embarrassing theatre of action. As things are, the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* is the organ and instrument of the *πνεῦμα*, so far as earthly activities are concerned ; but it is not a fit or perfect " body " for the " spirit."

This " spirit "—the true personality—may be " quenched " (1 Thess. v. 19) by the influence of base habits ; and it requires to be nurtured with spiritual food (1 Cor. x. 3), with which it can no more dispense than the *ψυχή* can dispense with its natural nourishment. The mental and moral endowments which men prize most—wisdom, know-

¹ Spenser, *Hymn in honour of Beauty*, i. 132.

ledge, powers of speech, gifts of healing, faith, hope, love—are pre-eminently *πνευματικά* (1 Cor. xii. 1, 8–10, xiii. 13). All are not of equal value, nor are all equally permanent, but they all belong to the “spiritual” part of man. The “spirit” cannot fully express itself without their exercise; and this is true not only of such essential graces as faith and love, but of faculties purely intellectual as well. If we are rightly to pray “with the spirit” (*πνεῦμα*) we must pray also “with the understanding” (*νοῦς*, 1 Cor. xiv. 15). It is the *πνεῦμα*, the Divine in man, by which Divine things are discerned. The *ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος* does not apprehend the things of the Spirit of God; that is for the *πνευματικός* (1 Cor. ii. 14, 15). And the reason is given in one sentence in another context: *ὁ δὲ κολλώμενος τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν πνεύμα ἔστιν*, “he that is joined to the Lord is *one spirit*” (1 Cor. vi. 17). It is because of the essential affinity between the human spirit and the Divine Spirit that communion with God is possible. The master-thought of St. Paul is expressed in the two words *ἐν Χριστῷ*; but it is to be observed that the supreme spiritual condition thus described depends for its possibility upon the presence of the Divine Spirit in man and the kinship of the human spirit with God. St. Paul’s doctrine of the Incarnation of Christ (and, as we shall see, his doctrine of the Resurrection of mankind) has its roots in the Hebrew conception of man as made after the Divine likeness in respect of his “spirit.”

What is the characteristic action of “spirit,” whether human or divine? And what is its most natural expression? St. Paul gives the answer again and again, and most succinctly at 2 Corinthians iii. 6, *τὸ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ*. “The spirit quickeneth, giveth life.” To give life is the characteristic action of *πνεῦμα*, and its inevitable expression and manifestation is *ζωή*, the presence of life. As *σὰρξ* is always in process of decay, of decease; so *πνεῦμα* is always in process

of giving forth life. This contrast is continually before St. Paul's mind. "The mind (*φρόνημα*, the bent and tendency) of the flesh is death, but the mind of the spirit is life and peace" (Rom. viii. 6). It is thus that in the spirit we find our freedom, and obtain release from the iron chains of physical causation, the bondage of the strongest desire. "The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus made me free from the law of sin and death" (Rom. viii. 2). "They that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. If any one have not the Spirit of Christ, he is not of Him. But if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness" (Rom. viii. 8-10). Such thoughts, of spirit as essentially *free* and *life-giving*, lead directly to the thought of continued life when the spirit has asserted its supremacy over the flesh. "If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through His Spirit that dwelleth in you" (Rom. viii. 11). But the Apostle gives no hint here of how he conceives that this "quickenings" of "mortal bodies" (*τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν*) is to be brought about. He approaches this subject somewhat more nearly in Galatians vi. 8, a passage which brings us back to this great illustration of the seed and the harvest in 1 Corinthians xv.: "He that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption, but he that soweth to the spirit shall of the spirit reap eternal life." We partly make, although we partly inherit, our character; and the seed sown by ourselves will yield its fruit just as surely as the seed which was "sown" at our birth.

V.

We now return to the antithesis of 1 Corinthians xv. 44 : *σπείρεται σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρεται σῶμα πνευματικόν*. "It

is sown a psychical body ; it is raised a spiritual body " ; the former being the seed of which the latter is the harvest. St. Paul does not say that the *ψυχή* is the seed of which the *πνεῦμα* is the fruit ; between these, " the soul " and " the spirit," there is no continuity, nor are they really akin. They are sharply contrasted.¹ Still less is the *σάρξ* the seed, of which the " spiritual " body is the fruit ; the *σάρξ* has no potentiality of life in it at all. The *σῶμα ψυχικόν* includes the *σάρξ* indeed, but it includes more, in the case of humanity ; it stands for all that externally is characteristic of the man, his appearance, his gestures, his manner of speech, perhaps even his affections, his intellectual pursuits, his habits, his temper—all, in short, that make up the man as he appears to his fellows in the commerce of life. The *σῶμα ψυχικόν* is " the temple of the spirit " ; but if the spirit be quenched or starved or repressed by the flesh, then the man is a mere *ψυχικός*, whereas, to reach his highest, he should be *πνευματικός*. The variety of " natural character " is one of the most obvious facts of life, but this is quite consistent with that " unity of the spirit," which is one of St. Paul's deepest convictions. That there is only *one spirit* amid all the diversity of human characters is so certain a postulate for him, that he argues from it to the essential unity of the Christian Society (Eph. iv. 4).

Now this *σῶμα ψυχικόν* can only reach its highest, like all other living organisms, through the passage of death. It is not quickened except it die. For the process of death can only destroy that in it which is akin to the flesh ; it need not kill those better elements which have such kinship with the *πνεῦμα* that the *πνεῦμα* could tabernacle among them. And the fruit which is the sequel of the seed's death is the result-

¹ The *πνεῦμα* is directly given by God at the man's birth ; compare the passage quoted above (p. 494 n.) from Philo, whose view is that the *πνεῦμα* is the essence, the *οὐσία*, of the *ψυχή*.

ant of these nobler qualities, quickened more energetically than before by the *πνεῦμα*, which is freed from its old restraints.

Here we begin to see something of the meaning of St. Paul's conception of Christ as the Life Giver (v. 22), of his pronouncement that "the Ultimate Man became a Life-giving Spirit." For of Christ was it also true, that the seed is not quickened except it die. Even His Life-giving powers could not find full scope except through the release of death. He "became a Life-giving Spirit" at His Resurrection, and not in fullest measure until then. Not until He had passed through the emancipation of death, could His Spirit descend in abundant streams of benediction upon His spiritual kindred. Pentecost came after Calvary. *Accipe spiritum sanctum* was the word of power of His Risen Life (John xx. 22). And not until He had passed through death into the glory of the Resurrection could His Spirit be strong to quicken and revive those who had died "in Him." This is the Pauline counterpart of the saying, "It is expedient for you that I go away" (John xvi. 7).

No explanation is given by St. Paul of the mode or manner in which he conceives of the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* of the believer being quickened by the action of the *πνεῦμα* of Christ upon the *πνεῦμα* which is the centre of the man's personality. All that he tells us is that this is the secret of the Resurrection of Christ. After death His *σῶμα ψυχικόν* was quickened into the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, "the body of His glory," the action of the Divine Spirit being so overmasteringly efficacious, that no sensuous or fleshly element was left behind in the sepulchre. It was transfigured and transformed, the body of earth being in His case, even throughout His earthly progress, a fit habitation for the *πνεῦμα*. For sin had never defiled it, nor had temptation ever thwarted the activities of the spirit of Christ. But even in the best and holiest of

His disciples, there is a continual warfare between the lower and the higher nature, between the flesh and the spirit; and the spirit is not always victor. When it is victorious, it is in virtue of the grace of the Risen Life of Christ, that is, because of the active co-operation of the Spirit of Christ. The Christian's supreme privilege in this life is that "even when we were dead through our trespasses [God] quickened us together with Christ, and raised us up with Him, and made us to sit with Him in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus" (Eph. ii. 5). So to live "is Christ" (Phil. i. 21). And he of whom this is true may say, "I live, yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. ii. 20). The conflict with sin is, as it were, a perpetual Passion, "always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus," but it is in order that "the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body" (2 Cor. iv. 10). Yet this spiritual power is, while we are in the flesh, only "the firstfruits of the Spirit," and we are in continual unrest while we wait "for our adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body" (Rom. viii. 23). This "redemption of the body" is the fulness of the Christian hope.

Yet the fleshly body has the taint of sin. It is not like the fleshly Body of Christ, pure from sin. And sin has the seed of death. In so far as it is thus tainted, the body of earth cannot survive the passage of death. Thus its "redemption" must involve the abandonment of that which is tainted and corruptible, in order that the worthier elements of the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* may be transfigured and transformed into a fit habitation for the spirit. Here is the essential difference between the Resurrection of Christ and the Resurrection of Christians. For Him there was no need of a "redemption" of the body; by the evolution of death, the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* became the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, nothing being left behind as base and unworthy. For us "redemption" is inevitable, and this involves a laying aside of the flesh, as we know

it and have experienced it. In our case, the fleshly body moulders in the grave ; but whatever has been best in this earthly habitation of the spirit is to reappear, transfigured, ennobled, strengthened, to serve as the eternal habitation of the spirit hereafter. The *σῶμα πνευματικόν* does not then bear exactly the same relation to the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* in the case of the Christian that it bore in the case of Christ.

Nor is the revivification of the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* in the case of the dead Christian hereafter comparable to the revivification of the dead bodies of Lazarus and the Widow's Son. For, in their case, as would appear from the narratives, the physical process of decay was arrested by a special Divine intervention, and the body to which the life (the *ψυχή*) was recalled by Christ's word was the same body—flesh and blood—as that which had walked on earth before it was stricken down by death. The body of Lazarus when he was restored to his sisters was not a "spiritual body," but a "psychical body" still. No such change had passed over it.

In our case, the physical process of decay will not be arrested. Our bodies of flesh will be resolved into the elements from which they sprang. But, for all that, there will be a "something" which will persist, which can be quickened into a larger life only through the passage of death. This "something" is the seed of the spiritual body of the hereafter, and it will be quickened into life by the action of the life-giving Spirit of Christ upon the *πνεῦμα* which has assimilated and attracted and used it as its appropriate organ and instrument. That in our bodies which is akin to earth, to the "first man, who is of earth," will be left behind us. That which is akin to heaven, to the "second Man, who is of heaven," will be retained. "As we have borne the image of the earthy, so we shall bear the image of the heavenly." Our bodies shall be "conformed to the

body of His glory " (Phil. iii. 20). Such seems to be the teaching of St. Paul about the "spiritual body."

VI.

At v. 50 the Apostle proceeds to give the answer to a question which the foregoing discussion would naturally suggest. He has explained that the *σῶμα πνευματικόν* of the future will not be identical with the *σῶμα ψυχικόν* of the present. How then will it be with those who are alive at the time of Christ's Parousia? *Their* "quickenings," as he said at v. 23, must precede the quickening of the dead in Christ. But "flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God" (v. 50); how then are they to share in the heavenly life? The answer, he says, is a *μυστήριον*, a secret that has been revealed to him. It could not be argued out on grounds of reason alone. But this is the answer. It is indeed the case that "we shall not all sleep," but "we *shall* all be changed"—not through a gradual and invisible transformation like that of the seed in the earth, but *ἐν ᾠρώ*, in an instant, upon the sounding of the "last trumpet" (v. 51). For in the Day of the Parousia "the trumpet shall sound," as the ancient apocalypses had told (2 Esdr. vi. 23; cf. Matt. xxiv. 31). And then not only shall "the dead be raised incorruptible," but we who are living at the time "shall be changed" (v. 53). The evolution of the "natural" into the "spiritual" body shall take place, instantaneously and not gradually, as in the case of the dead. This is the *μυστήριον* of the portion of those "in Christ" who are alive at the time of His Second Coming.

This, then, is the consummation. As he said in v. 23, Christ is the firstfruits of the Resurrection harvest; next are His living disciples; last of all the company of the blessed dead. This shall be the complete fulfilment of the prophet's words: "Death is swallowed up in victory" (Isa. xxv. 8).

Another prophet had asked : “ O death, where is thy sting ? O grave, where is thy victory ? ” (Hos. xiii. 14), as he thought of the irresistible might of Jehovah. But the secret of the victory is clearer now. It is “through our Lord Jesus Christ.”

Having this hope, be steadfast, for earthly labour is not in vain, if it be “in the Lord” (v. 58). Every act and thought leaves its trace ; it affects that *σῶμα ψυχικόν*, which is, as it were, the seed of the *σῶμα πνευματικόν*, the companion of the spirit in the world which flesh and blood cannot inherit.

J. H. BERNARD.

THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS.

VI.

CREDIBILITY *contd.*—THE POST-RESURRECTION APPEARANCES.

It is the testimony of all the New Testament witnesses—of the Gospels, of the Book of Acts, of St. Paul—that Jesus did appear to His disciples after His Resurrection. It was not simply the voices of angels proclaiming to the women that He had risen—not even the eloquent fact of the empty tomb—which produced in the disciples the immovable conviction that their Master had indeed burst the bands of death, and lived to die no more.¹ They believed, and unitedly testified, that they had seen Him, conversed with Him, eaten and drunk with Him ;² could give place, and date, and names, to His appearances to them. Often in the primitive circles, while the Apostles were still in their midst at Jerusalem, must the story of the time, occasion

¹ The reports of the women and of others were at first received with incredulity (Mark xvi. 11, 13, 14 ; Luke xxiv. 11).

² Acts x. 41.

and manner of the chief of these manifestations, and of the incidents connected with them, have been recited.

There is a point here, it should be noted in passing, in which the weakness of the assault on the testimony for the Resurrection is specially apparent. The assumption, practically, of the hostile critics of that testimony is that the Church had no history; that it knew nothing, really, of its own past; that myths and legends grew up in rank abundance, and were everywhere eagerly received; that the writers of the Gospels had no scrupulous conscience for truth, but imagined, manipulated and altered their materials at pleasure.¹ Any Church of our own day could give a good account of its origin, and of the events in its history, say, for the past fifty years. But the Churches founded by the Apostles—even the Mother-Church at Jerusalem—are believed to have had no such capability. The early believers had a different opinion of their knowledge and responsibility,² and of their ability to discern between true and false. They were not so ready as the objectors imagine to be imposed on by “cunningly devised fables.”³ The Church to which they belonged had a continuous history; they *thought* they knew how it originated, on what facts it was based, who were its early witnesses, and to what they testified; and they told their story without doubt or hesitation.

This witness which the Apostles bore had nothing vague or intangible about it. It was in large part full, detailed, circumstantial. It was not “appearances” simply, but prolonged interviews, that were alleged. The testimony must be treated in view of the actual circumstances and relations between persons in the Apostolic community—

¹ This is really the assumption, e.g., underlying the Abbé Loisy's newly published *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*.

² Cf. St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 15.

³ 2 Peter i. 16.

another point often overlooked. When, e.g., it is argued, as by Weizsäcker,¹ that, when the author of the Acts makes St. Peter say, "We ate and drank with Him after He rose from the dead,"² he employs a mode of representing the Risen Christ impossible to St. Paul, it has to be asked whether St. Luke, who accompanied St. Paul for so many years, would have ventured to put into the mouths of St. Peter and of St. Paul himself³ such speeches as are found in Acts, if they had been wholly alien to the Apostles' belief and testimony.⁴ We are brought here, in short, to the alternative: either narratives of the kind must be dismissed as wilful fiction, for unconscious legend is impossible in face of the knowledge which the Church possessed of its own beginnings; or if they are allowed to rest on original authentic tradition, they can leave no doubt upon the mind that Jesus was believed to have risen and to have appeared in bodily reality to His disciples.

The fact, however, as before, remains, and has now to be dealt with, that the narratives of the Resurrection appearances *are* challenged, and, line by line, point by point, the story which they tell is sought to be discredited. The grounds on which this is done are various. It is objected that the Gospels give different versions of these appearances, and that none gives *all* the appearances; that the evidence, even if allowed, is not of a kind to satisfy the demands of science—Renan, e.g., asks that the miracle of resurrection be performed before "a commission composed of physiologists, physicists, chemists, persons accustomed to historical criticism," and be repeated as often as desired;⁵

¹ *Apost. Age*, i. p. 10. Thus also Loisy, ii. p. 772.

² Acts x. 41.

³ E.g., Acts xiii. 31.

⁴ Weizsäcker does not, of course, admit St. Luke's authorship of the Acts. His argument breaks down for every one who does.

⁵ *Vie de Jésus*, Introd. pp. i., ii.

that Jesus appeared to none but His own disciples ; that legends of resurrection are not uncommon, and are explicable from natural tendencies of the mind.¹ To all which it is sufficient at present to reply that the evidence was not designed to satisfy scientific experts,² but to produce faith in those "chosen before of God,"³ that they might be "witnesses" to others ; and that, as observed earlier, it is not here proposed to set up *a priori* demands for evidence, but to examine carefully what evidence we have, and to ask whether, with what else is known of Jesus, it is not sufficient to sustain the faith that He is risen from the dead, nay—to shut us up to that faith as the only reasonable explanation of the facts.

It is desirable to begin in this inquiry by collecting the evidence for the appearances, and considering generally the value to be attached to the same. The several appearances can then be discussed in order.

There *were*, as already said, appearances of the Risen Jesus, or what were taken to be such, to His followers. St. Paul's list in 1 Corinthians xv. 3–8 is allowed even by the most sceptical to afford unassailable testimony on this head.⁴ It is further implied in the accounts, and is generally conceded, that these appearances extended over a considerable time—at least some days or weeks. St. Luke states the

¹ "Heroes," Renan declares, "do not die." "At the moment when Mohammed expired Omar issued from the tent sabre in hand, and declared he would strike off the head of any one who would dare to say that the Prophet was no more" (*Les Apôtres*, p. 3). But heroes *do* die, and the parallel is without relevance. Mohammed's followers never seriously claimed that the Prophet did not die, or had risen from the dead. There is no instance in history, apart from Christianity, of a religion established on belief in the Resurrection of its Founder. This is discussed later.

² Cf. Luke xvi. 30, 31. A mere intellectual conviction, even if produced, would have been of no avail for the end proposed.

³ Acts x. 40–1.

⁴ Strauss, *New Life of Jesus* i. p. 400. Renan, *Les Apôtres*, p. ix. Weizsäcker, *Apost. Age*, ch. i. Keim, *Jesus of Nazare*, vi. p. 279 and generally.

period at "forty days."¹ "In Matthew," Strauss says, "the appearance of Jesus upon the mountain in Galilee must be supposed to have taken place long enough after the Resurrection to give time for the disciples to return back from Jerusalem to Galilee."² St. Paul³ and St. John likewise assume a considerable period during which Jesus was manifested to His disciples. The chronological datum of St. Luke in Acts i. 3 must be allowed to rule the interpretation of the obviously condensed ("foreshortened") account of the closing chapter of his Gospel. Events, as will be seen later, are there compressed which were afterwards to be narrated more in detail.

Furthermore, the witnesses to the appearances of Jesus are *many*, and all, it can be claimed, are entitled to be heard with a presumption of their honesty and credibility. Only leading points need be recalled. It was before stated that St. John is here unhesitatingly accepted as an eye-witness. St. Mark was the companion of St. Peter. St. Luke was the companion of St. Paul, and a zealous investigator on his own account.⁴ St. Paul had direct communication with St. Peter, St. James, St. John and other members of the original Apostolic company.⁵ St. Matthew is believed to be connected with at least the original of his Gospel—to stand in a real way behind it. The Appendix to St. Mark is yet an unsolved problem. The fact that it appears in nearly all extant MSS. and versions⁶ points to

¹ Acts i. 3. ² *Ut supra*, ii. p. 420.

³ Renan finds in 1 Cor. xv. 3–8 evidence of "the long duration of the appearances." Cf. Acts xiii. 31.

⁴ Luke i. 1–4.

⁵ Gal. i. 18, 19, ii. 1, 9; Acts ix. 26–7.

⁶ The section (chap. xvi. 9–20) is absent, as is well known, from Cod. Sin. and Cod. Vat., from Syr. Sin., from some Armenian and Ethiopic MSS., etc.; on the other hand, "it is supported by the vast majority of uncials," "by the cursives in a body," by all lectionaries and most versions (cf. art. : "Mark" in Hastings' *Dict. of Bible*, iii. p. 252). On the adverse patristic testimony, see Burgon, chap. v.

a very early date, and perhaps to a close relation with St. Mark himself. It does not seem warranted to regard it as simply a summary of incidents based on St. Luke and St. John.¹ It does not show linguistic dependence on the other Gospels ; furnishes original (Mark-like) details ; bears generally the stamp of a distinct and authentic tradition.²

The *amplitude* and *weight* of the evidence will best be seen by a survey of its particulars as furnished by these various witnesses :—

1. St. Mark breaks off at chapter xvi. 8, but in verse 7 forecasts a meeting of Jesus with the disciples in Galilee, as Jesus had foretold.³ This is evidently the collective meeting which St. Matthew narrates.

2. St. Matthew narrates the meeting in Galilee (on “ the mountain where Jesus had appointed them ”),⁴ but tells also of an appearance to the women on the morning of the Resurrection. The Galilean meeting, with its great commission, “ Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations,” etc., is the objective of St. Matthew’s Gospel, and to it he hastens without pausing on intermediate events. Yet the fact that he relates the appearance of the women (in which that to Mary Magdalene may be merged),⁵ shows

¹ Keim describes it unjustly as “ a violent attempt at adjustment between Mark and Luke—John, between Galilee and Jerusalem ” (vi. p. 318). The incidents in the Appendix must all have been well known in the early circles to which St. Mark (son of the Mary in whose home the Church met for worship, Acts xii. 12) belonged.

² Mr. Latham (*Risen Master*, pp. 202–3) is a little hard on the Appendix in fastening on its emphasis of “ unbelief ” (vers. 11, 16). It is precisely in St. Mark and St. Matthew that the emphasis is laid on *ἀπιστία* (Mark vi. 6, ix. 24 ; Matt. xiii. 58, xvii. 20) ; St. Luke uses the verb in chap. xxiv. 11, 41. On upbraiding, cf. Luke xxiv. 25.

³ Cf. Mark xiv. 28 ; Matt. xxvi. 32. “ After I am raised up I will go before you into Galilee.”

⁴ Matt. xxviii. 16–20. Regarding this “ appointment ” the Gospels are silent. Only the promise is given : “ There shall ye see Him [Me] ” (Matt. xxviii. 7, 10 ; Mark xvi. 7).

⁵ Matt. xxviii. 9, 10. Cf. John xx. 14–17.

that the appointed meeting was not held to exclude earlier appearances.

3. St. Luke has a rich store of original tradition, confined, however, to Jerusalem and its neighbourhood. While St. Matthew concentrates on the meeting in Galilee, St. Luke is chiefly interested in the appearances on the Resurrection day and in Jerusalem, as leading up to the promise of the Spirit and the Ascension at Bethany. His accounts include an appearance to St. Peter,¹ the appearance to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus,² an appearance to the eleven in the evening³—these all on Easter Day—finally, a meeting, more fully reported in Acts, on the day of Ascension.⁴ Nothing is said of appearances in Galilee, though ample room is left for these, if indeed they are not implied, in the “forty days” of Acts i. 3.⁵

4. St. John, writing, it is to be remembered, with knowledge of the other Gospels, gives additional valuable information concerning the events of the Resurrection morning, and records, besides the appearance to Mary Magdalene in the garden,⁶ an appearance to the assembled disciples that same evening,⁷ another appearance to the eleven eight days after,⁸ and an appearance to seven disciples some time later, at the Lake of Galilee.⁹ St. John’s narratives abound in minute touches which only personal knowledge could impart.

5. St. Paul’s list in 1 Corinthians xv. 3–8—the earliest written testimony, and of undoubted genuineness—covers a wide area. It leaves unnoticed the appearances to the women, but enumerates an appearance to St. Peter, one to the “twelve” (more strictly “the eleven”),¹⁰ one to over five

¹ Luke xxiv. 34. Cf. 1 Cor. xv. 5. ² Luke xxv. 13, 32.

³ Vers. 33–43. ⁴ Vers. 50, 51; cf. Acts i. 4–12.

⁵ “Appearing to them by the space of forty days” (Acts i. 3).

⁶ John xx. 14–17.

⁷ John xx. 19–25. ⁸ Vers. 26–28. ⁹ John xxi. 1–14.

¹⁰ Professor Lake says: “‘The twelve’ is the title of a body of men who were originally twelve in number, but it had become a conventional name, and bore no necessary relation to the actual number” (p. 37).

hundred brethren at once, the majority of them still living, one to St. James, and yet another to all the Apostles. To this series St. Paul adds, as of equal validity with the rest, the appearance to himself.

One point about this list is of interest in connexion with the question of "silence" in the Gospels. St. Luke was St. Paul's companion. Apart from what he must often have heard from St. Paul's own lips, he was undoubtedly familiar with this Epistle to the Corinthians, with its enumeration of appearances. Yet in his Gospel and in Acts he omits all mention of the great appearance to the five hundred brethren at once (probably to be identified with St. Matthew's Galilean meeting), and of the appearance to St. James.¹ This bears also on the point of the Evangelist's supposed ignorance in his Gospel of any longer interval than a single day between the Resurrection and the Ascension.² How, it may be asked, was this possible, in view of the explicit testimony of St. Paul, known to St. Luke, to Christ's numerous appearances? Acts i. makes it plain that St. Luke did know.

6. Lastly, the Appendix to St. Mark contains brief notices of *three* of the above appearances—the appearance to Mary Magdalene, that to the two disciples, and an appearance to the eleven.³ It is probable that, as in St. Luke, this one appearance to the eleven is made to stand for all, and that some of the injunctions attached to it really belong to other meetings.

In estimating the *value* of this range of testimony, the

¹ Cf. the remarks of Godet on this point in his *Com. on St. Luke*, E.T., ii. p. 363.

² Thus Strauss, Weizsäcker, Keim, etc., but also Meyer, Alford and others. Surely, however, it is evident of itself that St. Luke could not suppose that the journey to Bethany, and the Ascension (chap. xxiv. 50, 51) took place late at night after a crowded day, and the prolonged evening meeting detailed in vers. 39–49. See next paper.

³ Mark xvi. 9–20.

following points are of significance. It will be seen—(1) that, while certain of the appearances depend on one witness, most are doubly or even triply attested ; (2) that, while of one or two we have only brief notices, of most there are detailed accounts ; (3) that, if the narratives are at all to be trusted, they leave no room for doubt as to the Resurrection of the Lord in the body. Special weight in this connexion must be attached to the testimony of St. John and St. Paul—one a personal witness, the other basing on first-hand communications. It is of interest, accordingly, to note how large a part of the entire case is covered by the testimony of these two. Thus St. John attests : (1) the appearance to Mary Magdalene, whose summons brought him to the tomb ;¹ (2) *two* appearances to the eleven, at both of which he was present ;² and (3) the meeting at the Lake of Galilee, at which again he was present³—*four* instances out of a total of ten. St. Paul again attests : (1) the appearance to St. Peter ; (2) *two* appearances to the Apostles, one coinciding with one of St. John's ; (3) the appearance to the five hundred ; and (4) the appearance to St. James—*four* additional to St. John's or, between the two, *eight* appearances. A further noteworthy result is that, with the exception of the appearance to the women in St. Matthew, the *singly* attested appearances are among the *best* attested, for they are included in the above list ; likewise the *greater* appearances, if, as is usually assumed, the appearance to the five hundred is to be identified with the meeting in Galilee, are, with one exception (the appearance to the disciples on the way to Emmaus), all included here. It will be shown after that the Emmaus narrative, corroborated by the Appendix to St. Mark, is one of the most credible of the series.

On the basis of this analysis, the attempt may now be

¹ John xx. 3.

² Vers. 19–29.

³ John xxi. 2.

made to place the recorded appearances in their *order*, and to exhibit the degree of attestation that pertains to each. It is only to be borne in mind, what formerly was said, that in no case is it the design of the Evangelists to furnish *proofs* for the Resurrection.¹ Their object is simply to supply information, each in accordance with his particular aim, regarding a fact already universally believed. Each gives his own selection of incidents, and no single narrative makes any pretence to be complete.²

The appearances to the disciples may be arranged as follows :—

1. The appearance to Mary Magdalene (John, Appendix to Mark). According to the Marcan Appendix this appearance was the “first.”

2. The appearance to the women on their way to the disciples (Matt.). The relation to (1) is considered below.

3. The appearance to St. Peter (Luke, Paul). St. Paul doubtless had the fact from St. Peter himself. St. Luke probably had it from St. Paul. But it was known from the beginning.³

4. The appearance to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus (Luke, Appendix to Mark). St. Luke gives the detailed account.

5. The appearance to the assembled disciples in the evening (Luke, John, Paul, Appendix to Mark). The details are given in St. Luke and St. John.

These five appearances all occurred on the day of Resurrection.

6. The second appearance to the eleven, “eight days

¹ This should be partially qualified in the case of St. John, who does exhibit an evidential purpose (chap. xx. 31, xxi. 24).

² Each Evangelist would have been ready to endorse the concluding words in St. John: “There are also many other things which Jesus did,” etc. (xxi. 25; cf. xx. 31).

³ Luke xxiv. 34. St. Mark may have had this appearance in view in the words: “Go, tell His disciples and Peter” (xvi. 7).

after " (John). St. John had told how, on the previous occasion, Thomas was not present. The doubt of Thomas was now removed.

7. An appearance to seven disciples at the Lake of Galilee (John).

8. The great appearance to over five hundred brethren at once (Paul). This, as above said, is probably identical with the "appointed" meeting in Galilee, when the "eleven" received their Lord's great commission (Matt.).

9. An appearance to St. James (Paul).

10. The final appearance to the eleven (Paul), identical with the meeting of Jesus with His disciples prior to His Ascension (Luke in Gospel and Acts ; Appendix to Mark).

It will be perceived from this enumeration that there were in all no fewer than *five* appearances of Jesus—half of the total number—to the Apostles, when all, or a majority, were present ; in one instance at a large gathering of over five hundred. Of the remaining instances, three were private (to Mary, St. Peter, St. James): one was to two disciples on a journey ; one was to the group of women. St. Matthew probably introduces the last because of the message then repeated to meet the Lord in Galilee. St. Luke, as shown, confines himself to the meetings in and about Jerusalem. St. Paul dwells naturally for his purpose on the appearances to the Apostles, including that to James, and the meeting with the five hundred. St. John fills up from his reminiscences what the others had left untold—the tender scene with the Magdalene, the second appearance to the Apostles, the appearance to the seven in Galilee. It all seems very natural. [The pieces of the puzzle are perhaps not so hard to put together after all.

The circumstances of the several appearances must now be more carefully investigated, with a view to the further elucidation of their *nature* and *reality*. But, first,

there are certain threads of the Synoptical narratives which require to be gathered up, and related to what follows.

1. Two of the Evangelists, St. Matthew and St. Mark, agree that the women at the tomb *received a message* to give to the disciples.¹ St. Luke does not mention this message, yet relates : " They returned from the tomb, and told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest " ² (the implication of a wider company should be noted). In the report of the words spoken by the angels to the women, however, there is an important variation in St. Luke, which needs consideration. In the two other Synoptics, the women are directed to tell the disciples that Jesus goes before them into Galilee, and that there they will see Him. Instead of this message, St. Luke reads : " Remember how He spake unto you when He was yet in Galilee, saying that the Son of Man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men and be crucified, and the third day rise again. And they remembered His words."³ In St. Matthew, further, the words which in St. Mark appear in connexion with the direction about Galilee (" as He said unto you ") ⁴ are transferred to the announcement of the Resurrection (" as He said "),⁵ and the angel's message closes with the statement, " Lo, I have told you." The difficulty of deriving the form in St. Luke from the others is obvious (the word " Galilee " occurring in both should not mislead). The simple explanation seems to be that it is not the design of St. Luke to relate the appearances in Galilee (cf., however, Acts i. 3 ; " appearing to them by the space of forty days "); he therefore omits the part of the message bearing on this point. For the rest, Jesus did do both the things here stated : (1) announce when in Galilee His approaching

¹ Matt. xxviii. 7 ; Mark xvi. 7.

² Luke xxiv. 9. ³ Luke xxiv. 6-8. ⁴ Mark xvi 7.

⁵ Matt. xxviii. 6.

death and Resurrection ¹ (so in Matt.), and St. Luke simply repeats His words ; and (2) announce that He would meet His disciples in Galilee ² ("as He said unto you," Mark). This second part St. Luke passes over.

2. In the close of his narrative of the Resurrection, St. Matthew gives *the sequel to his story of the guard at the tomb*,³ formerly alluded to. Certain of the guard, hastening to the city, told the chief priests what had happened. These, after counsel with the elders, bribed the soldiers to spread the report that the disciples had stolen the body of Jesus while they (the guard) slept, promising to use their interest with Pilate to secure them from harm. This episode, it was before seen, is rejected by the critics as fabulous. Yet it is difficult to believe that a narrative so circumstantial could be simple invention,⁴ or have no foundation in fact. Nor are the grounds alleged adequate to sustain this view of it. The central point in the story—the charge of stealing the body—is evidently historical. It is given as a current report when the Gospel was written,⁵ and is independently attested.⁶ As giving the Jewish version of the Resurrection, it has value as a left-hand testimony to the fact of the grave being found empty. When it is asked, Is it likely that the soldiers should accept a bribe to plead guilty to a military offence—sleeping on duty—which was punishable by death?⁷ it is overlooked that the breach of discipline had already been committed in their flight

¹ Cf. Matt. xvi. 21 ; xvii. 9–13, etc. ² Matt. xxvi. 32 ; Mark xiv. 28.

³ Matt. xxvii. 11–5. Cf. chap. xxvii. 62–66.

⁴ Professor Lake thinks that the episode has "neither intrinsic nor traditional probability." It is, in his view, "nothing more than a fragment of controversy" between Jews and Gentiles, "in which each imputed unworthy motives to the other, and stated suggestions as established facts" (p. 180).

⁵ Matt. xxviii. 15.

⁶ Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho*, 108 ; Tertullian, *On Spectacles*, 30.

⁷ Lake, p. 178.

from the tomb, and admission that the tomb was open and the body gone. The theft by the disciples was only a pretext to cover an event which both soldiers and priests were aware had really a more marvellous character. The case would be presented in a truer light to Pilate, and the soldiers screened. It was probably from some of the guards themselves—led, like the centurion, to say, “Truly this man was the Son of God”¹—that the facts were ascertained.²

This leads to the consideration of the distinct appearances.

1. Little use has up to this point been made of the testimony of St. John. It is now necessary to consider that testimony in its relation to the Synoptics, as embodying the narrative of the first of our Lord’s recorded appearances—that to *Mary Magdalene*.³ St. John has the supreme qualification as a witness that he himself was *magna pars* in the transactions he records. His narrative has an autoptic character. Part of its design apparently is to give greater precision to certain events which the other Gospels had more or less generalized. It is a piece of testimony of the first importance.

In the story of the appearance to Mary Magdalene, St. John so far goes with the Synoptics that he tells how Mary Magdalene came in the early morning to the tomb of Jesus, and found the stone taken away.⁴ Mention is not made of companions, but probably at least one other is implied in Mary’s words: “They have taken away the Lord out of the tomb, and *we* know not where they have laid Him.”⁵ The same words may suggest that, either by her own inspection or that of others, Mary had ascertained that the tomb was empty—not simply open.

¹ Mark xv. 39.

² Dr. Forrest, in his *Christ of History and Experience*, says: this “incident related by Matthew . . . though it is not corroborated in any of the other Gospels, has, I think, every mark of probability” (p. 145). Cf. Alford on Matt. xxvii. 62–66.

³ John xx. 11–18.

⁴ Ver. 1.

⁵ Ver. 2.

But here St. John diverges. We learn from him how, concluding that the body had been removed, Mary at once ran to carry the news to St. Peter and St. John. It was still very early, and the disciples had to be sought for in their private—perhaps separate—lodgings (ver. 10). Aroused by her tale, they lost not a moment in hastening to the spot.¹ St. John—for he only can be meant by “the other disciple”²—outran St. Peter, and, coming first to the tomb, stooped and looked in, and saw (βλέπει) the linen cloths (ὀθονία) lying, but did not go further. St. Peter followed, but, with characteristic energy, at once entered, and beheld (θεωρεῖ), implying careful note), not simply the disposition of the cloths, but the peculiarity of the napkin for the head lying rolled up in a place by itself.³ St. John then found courage to enter, and “having seen, believed.”⁴ It is a weakening of this expression to suppose it to mean simply, “believed that the tomb was empty.” Both disciples believed this. But with a flash of true discernment St. John grasped the significance of what he saw, namely, that Jesus had risen—a truth to which⁵ the Scriptures had not yet led him.⁶ St. Peter, it is implied, though wondering,⁶ had still not attained to this confidence. The two disciples then returned home.⁷

Meanwhile Mary Magdalene had come back, and was “standing without at the tomb weeping.”⁸ Afterwards she too stooped and looked into the tomb, and had, like the other women, a “vision of angels”—in her case “two angels in white raiment,” one at the head, the other at the foot, of the ledge or slab where the body of Jesus had

¹ Ver. 3–10.

² Vers. 2, 3, 8.

³ Ver. 7. Mr. Latham’s ingenious reasoning from the disposition of the grave-cloths to the manner of the Resurrection should be studied in his *Risen Master*, chaps. i.–iii.

⁴ Ver. 8.

⁵ Ver. 9.

⁶ Cf. Luke xxii. 12, below.

⁷ Ver. 10.

⁸ Ver. 11.

lain.¹ Then came the meeting with the Lord described in the succeeding verses. At first Mary took the person who addressed her for the gardener, and besought him, if it was he who had borne away her Lord from the tomb, to tell her where he had laid Him.² Little trace here of the *hallucinée*, whose passion, according to Renan, "gave to the world a resuscitated god."³ Christ's tender word "Mary" illuminated her at once as to who He was, and with the exclamation "Rabboni," she would have clasped Him, had He permitted her.

The words with which the Risen Lord in this interview gently checked the movement of Mary at once to worship and to detain Him—to hold Him, now restored to her, as if never more to let Him go—have been the subject of sufficiently diverse interpretations. "Touch me not" (*μὴ μου ἅπτου*; R.V. marg., "Take not hold on Me"), Jesus said, "for I am not yet ascended unto My Father; but go unto My brethren, and say to them, I ascend unto My Father and your Father, and My God and your God."⁴ The meaning that lies on the surface is: "Do not hold me now, for I am not yet ascended unto My Father, but go at once unto My brethren," etc. But the terms of the message to the brethren ("Say unto them, I ascend," etc.) show that a deeper reason lay behind. "Tell them," its purport is, "that I am risen; the same, yet entered on a higher (the Ascension) life, in which old relations cannot be renewed, but better ones begin."⁵

If this striking narrative of St. John stood alone, it would be sufficiently attested, but it is corroborated by

¹ Vers. 11-13, see the plates of the tomb in Latham.

² Ver. 15.

³ *Vie de Jésus*, p. 434.

⁴ Ver. 17.

⁵ The chief interpretations of the passage can be seen in Godet, *Com. on St. John*, iii. pp. 311-13, and in Latham, *ut supra*, pp. 419-20. Godet takes it to mean: "I have not reached the state in which I shall be able to live with you in the communion I promised you" (p. 311).

two notices which probably are independent of it. The Appendix to St. Mark tells of the early morning appearance to Mary Magdalene ;¹ St. Luke records the visit of St. Peter to the tomb, in language closely resembling St. John's, with an indication later that he was not alone. St. Luke xxiv. 12 reads : " But Peter arose, and ran into the tomb ; and stooping and looking in, he seeth (*βλέπει*) the linen cloths (*ὀθονία*) by themselves ; and he departed to his home, wondering at that which was come to pass." In verse 24, the disciples journeying to Emmaus say : " And certain of them that were with us went to the tomb, and found it even as the women had said : but Him they saw not." ² On the ground of its absence from certain Western texts, the former passage (ver. 12) is regarded by textual critics with suspicion.³ This doubt does not attach to verse 24, which plainly has in view the visit described by St. John. Its genuineness, in turn, supports that of verse 12, where St. Peter only is mentioned. It may reasonably be supposed that St. John, in his fuller narrative, has the aim of rectifying a certain inexactitude in St. Luke's summary account. St. Luke, e.g., speaks of St. Peter, at the tomb, as " stooping and looking in." St. John, the disciple who accompanied St. Peter, explains that, while this was true of himself (cf. chap. xx. 5), St. Peter did more, actually entering the tomb and inspecting the contents. In his consecutive account, he makes clear also the precise time of this visit.

¹ On the supposed dependence on St. John, cf. remarks above.

² Meyer remarks : " Of the ' other disciple ' of John xx. 3, Luke says nothing, but, according to ver. 24, does not exclude him " (*Com. in loc.*).

³ The preponderance of early MSS. authority sustains the passage. Godet, who in his *Com. on St. Luke* (ii. p. 352) upholds the genuineness, treats it in his *Com. on St. John* (iii. p. 308) as " a gloss borrowed from St. John." Had it been so, it would surely have avoided the appearance of contradiction.

2. At this point a question of some nicety arises as to the relation of this appearance to Mary Magdalene, and *the appearance to the women* recorded in St. Matthew xxviii. 9, 10, which stands next upon our list. Are these appearances different? Or is the second (that in Matthew) merely a generalized form of the first (that in John)? The latter is the view taken by many scholars.¹ In favour of it is the fact that only two women, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary, are mentioned in St. Matthew's narrative.² We know, however, that there were other women present, and there is a marked contrast in the circumstances in the two narratives. The women in St. Matthew are already on their way to tell the disciples; they hold Jesus by the feet, and are apparently unrebuked (the act was *only* one of worship); the message, too, is different. The appearance to Mary may well be grouped (probably is) with that of the other women; it is not so easy to identify the latter with Mary's solitary experience. If, on the other hand, the appearances are taken to be distinct, a difficulty arises as to the order of time. The appearance to the women coming from the tomb would now seem to claim precedence over that to Mary, who had in the interval gone to Jerusalem and had returned. There is nothing absolutely to preclude this, if the note of order in the Appendix to St. Mark ("appeared first to Mary Magdalene") be surrendered. Some, accordingly, do place the appearance to the other women first.³

But even on the ordinarily received view that the appearance to Mary Magdalene was the prior, the problem, when the circumstances are fairly considered, does not seem insoluble. Both appearances took place in early morning, with at most an hour or two between

¹ E.g., Ebrard, Godet, Alford, Swete. ² Ver. 1.

³ E.g., Milligan, *The Resur. of our Lord*, pp. 259-60.

them. The disciples, mostly lodging apart—in Jerusalem,¹ in Bethany, elsewhere ²—could not be convened till later. The women, after their first hurried flight (cf. Mark xvi. 8), must have paused to regain their self-possession, to confer with one another on what they had seen and heard, to consider how they should proceed in conveying their tidings to the still scattered disciples. In such a pause, their hearts aflame with love and holy desire, Jesus, who a little earlier had made Himself known to Mary in the garden, appeared to them. Even before He approached a single Apostle, He disclosed Himself to this company of faithful hearts. His “All hail!” and the renewed commission to the disciples sealed the message at the tomb.

It is not unlikely that, before long, on her way back to the city, Mary Magdalene joined her sisters, and that, after interchange of experiences, the errand to the disciples was undertaken by the women together. Keen indeed must have been the chill to their enthusiasm at the reception their message met with when they did deliver it. Their words received no credence: were treated as “idle talk.”³ That the tomb was found empty, the Apostles did not dispute; but stories of visions of angels and appearances of Jesus they refused to accept. There was astonishment, but not belief. Yet it is this sceptical circle, antipathetic to visionary experiences, in which belief in the Resurrection is supposed spontaneously to have arisen through visions of their own!

3. It must have been still early on this eventful day, probably soon after the Apostle's visit to the tomb, and while he was still brooding on what had happened, that the third [appearance of Jesus took place—the *appearance to St. Peter*, attested by both St. Paul,⁴ and St. Luke.⁵

¹ As St. Peter and St. John above.

² Two were from Emmaus.

³ Luke xxiv. 10, 11, 22, 23. Cf. Mark xvi. 9–11.

⁴ 1 Cor. xv. 5.

⁵ Luke xxiv. 34.

The critics, as will be found, transfer this appearance from Jerusalem to Galilee, but without a shadow of a valid reason. It was in harmony with the tender, considerate spirit displayed by Jesus in all these manifestations that such an appearance should be granted, so soon after the Resurrection, to the disciple who had denied, yet who so devotedly loved Him—whom He Himself had named the “Rock.”¹ Like the appearance to St. James at a later period, the meeting was entirely private. It can only be conjectured how, with another look, reproachful perhaps, but gracious and forgiving, the memory was banished of that look turned upon St. Peter in the High Priest’s palace, which had overwhelmed him with such sorrow.² The great stone was now rolled away from his heart, as before the stone had been rolled from the tomb. The transformation which this appearance of Christ wrought in the Apostle is reflected in the excitement which the report of it created in the circle of the disciples. “The Lord hath risen indeed and hath appeared to Simon.”³ The disciples might disbelieve the women; they could not doubt the reality of the experience of St. Peter. The “conversion” which Jesus had predicted was realized, and thereafter the Apostle was to “strengthen” his brethren.⁴

4. As it is with the appearance to St. Peter, so it is with the other appearance which may be associated with this, as of the same private order—the *appearance to St. James*.⁵ It is among the latest of the appearances, as that to

¹ Matt. xvi. 18, John i. 42.

² Luke xxii. 61.

³ Luke xxiv. 34. Prof. Lake thinks it “uncertain” whether Simon Peter or another is intended in this passage—a characteristic excess of scepticism. He cannot believe that St. Luke has in view the appearance to Cephas referred to by St. Paul. He prefers, “with the courage of despair,” as he calls it, to “think that St. Luke himself did not write” the passage (pp. 101–3).

⁴ Luke xxii. 32.

⁵ 1 Cor. xv. 7.

Peter is the earliest. With regard to both, while the facts are well-attested, no particulars are given. It is not doubted that the person intended in St. Paul's notice is the well-known James, the brother of the Lord."¹ This of itself explains much. James, so far as is known, was not a believer in Jesus up to the time of the Crucifixion.² Yet immediately after the Ascension, he, and the other brethren of Jesus, are found in the company of the disciples.³ Thereafter he became a "pillar"⁴—finally the chief personage—in the Church at Jerusalem.⁵ He ranked with the Apostles.⁶ What could explain such a change, save that, like the other Apostles, he had "seen the Lord"?⁷ Christ's appearance to St. James was not simply His revelation to His own family—His kinsfolk according to the flesh—but was the qualification of this brother for lifelong Apostolic service. St. James exercised an authority at Jerusalem hardly second to that of St. Paul among the Churches of the Gentiles.

The remaining appearances will introduce us to the problems connected with the nature of the Resurrection body of the Lord.⁸

JAMES ORR.

¹ Gal. i. 19. Cf. Matt. xiii. 35; Mark vi. 3.

² Cf. John vii. 5.

³ Acts i. 14.

⁴ Gal. ii. 9.

⁵ Acts xii. 17, xv. 13, xxi. 18.

⁶ Gal. i. 19, ii. 9; 1 Cor. ix. 5.

⁷ Cf. 1 Cor. ix. 1.

⁸ Cf. Hegesippus in Eusebius, *Ecc. Hist.* ii. 23. There is a legend about St. James in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews* (cf. Westcott, *Introd. to Gospels*, p. 463; Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 274), to which, however, little, if any, weight can be attached. Apocryphal ideas will be considered later.

EZEKIEL'S VISIONS OF JERUSALEM.

THE tragedy of the fall of Jerusalem is a theme of undying interest. Regarded from the point of view of a later generation it seemed quite unparalleled, because of the development which had taken place in Israel's conception of God. That so great and peerless a God should abandon His people, and suffer His own temple to be laid low, was a marvel that could not have been believed, had it not been experienced. True, it had been foretold by the prophets, but the overpowering dreadfulness of the blow, regarded from the later point of view, exceeded the ability even of a prophet to express. It may be questioned, however, whether another event in the later history of Judah does not contain still more of the making of a tragedy. For if Josiah was really such an ardent reformer as he is represented, if he really adjusted the forms of the national life to the demands of a divinely sanctioned righteousness, and if men of piety were convinced that "righteousness exalteth a nation," what a contradiction to the divine justice was the defeat and death of the righteous king!

What, then, was it that Josiah did and Jehoiakim undid? What was the reformation of the one, and what the reaction of the other? The two questions naturally go together, but it is only the second which we can now consider. To answer the first, we should have to make a study of the narrative of the reformation; to answer the second, it must here suffice to make some examination of the visions described in Ezekiel viii.-ix. It should be mentioned that the present writer does not see his way to agree with the majority that the harmful type of religion established by Manasseh was Assyrio-Babylonian; he thinks that it was more probably in the main of north Arabian

origin. It is indeed not to be disputed that danger threatened the land of Judah in the later reigns from Babylon, but there was also danger, as the Old Testament, critically examined, appears to show, from north Arabia. One would therefore expect to find that some at least of the lower cults described in Ezekiel viii. was north Arabian, though beside them one would naturally look out for others that were Babylonian. And if Manasseh's type of religion was mainly north Arabian, one would expect the popular cults under Jehoiakim and Zedekiah to be also on the whole north Arabian.

Let us now turn to Ezekiel viii., and examine the details as briefly but as penetratingly as limits of space permit. In verse 3 we read that a spirit, or divine energy, lifted Ezekiel up and brought him "in visions of God" to Jerusalem, to the door of the north gateway of the inner court of the temple, "where was the place of the image of *Kin'ah hammakneh*." The prophet means to say that he was brought to the very same place where formerly (under Manasseh) the image referred to had stood. In a subsequent passage (v. 5) he says in effect that when his attention was free, he observed that the same image (removed by Josiah, and not yet set up again when the prophet left Jerusalem as an exile) had been erected once more, though in a different place. This, I think with Kraetzschmar, must be the meaning of the passage (cf. v. 3), which appears to run thus, "And I lifted up mine eyes northward, and, behold, north of the gate of the altar (?) was that image of *Kin'ah* at the entrance." ¹

Now, as to the name of the deity, *Kin'ah* and [*Ham-*] *makneh* are both plainly impossible; "that provokes to jealousy" is of course nothing but an attempt to make sense out of a second miswritten form of the name of the deity.

¹ Cornill omits this last word.

What can Kin'ah have come from? Not from Kewan, a title of Saturn and of the sun (cf. Am. v. 26¹; not from Kaneh, "reed," as Gunkel supposes,² comparing Psalm lxviii. 31 [30] "Rebuke the beast of the reeds," and interpreting the phrase "the image of the reeds" of the mythological dragon Tiâmat. Not improbably we should connect Kin'ah with the legendary names 'Anak, Akan and even Kena'an. If so, the name is north Arabian, and is probably a corruption of a title of the goddess Asherah. Several scholars have already recognized Asherah,³ but not ventured on an explanation.

It is equally hard to understand and to trace the origin of the superstition referred to in verse 10. There we read, "And I entered, and looked, and behold, every form of reptiles and (other) beasts [abominations] and all the idols of the house of Israel, graven upon the wall round about." The explanations of Robertson Smith, Toy and Gunkel seem to me hardly satisfactory. Neither clan-totems, nor Babylonian dragons ("helpers of Rahab," Job xi. 13) can justifiably be found here, especially as neither theory is consistent with the words, "and all the idols of the house of Israel," which intervene between "abominations" and "graven." It is only an enlarged experience of similarly corrupt passages elsewhere, and of the habits of the scribes, which can help us much here. For my part I am satisfied with making this suggestion—that both here and in Ezekiel xviii. 6 (as well as in some other Old Testament passages) "Israel" has been miswritten by the scribe for "Ishmael." As for the words rendered "reptiles and beasts," I take them to be a gloss consisting of two regional names, and defining for ancient readers the geographical meaning of

¹ *Expository Times*, December 1898; Stade's *Zeitschrift*, 1901, p. 201.

² *Schöpfung und Chaos* (1895), p. 141.

³ Davidson, for instance, says, "The image here may be this Ashera."

Ishmael in this passage. As the most probable original form of the text of verse 10, I would propose, "every form of abominations (=images), namely all the idols of the house of Ishmael, graven in the wall round about." North Arabian again.

Babylon, however, is not to miss its chance. It is in itself an extremely plausible view that the "women weeping for the Tammuz" (v. 14) are acting in accordance with Babylonian ritual. Tamûz was in fact one form of the name of the Babylonian god of vernal vegetation, whose disappearance was mourned by weeping women. I do not, however, think a reference to the Babylonian cult quite certain. Ritual mourning for the dead god existed in Canaan long before Zedekiah's time. Isaiah xvii. 10 (*see* Rev. Vers. marg.) suggests the name Na'aman; Hadad and Rimmon would also perhaps be possible. It is worth considering whether the description of a scene from the cult of Ashtart in Jeremiah vii. 18 and xlv. 17 ff. may not throw light on our passage. In a word, it may be at the sacred meal that the women are sitting, while they utter ritual benedictions (read *mebhārekōth*, "blessing," for *mebhakkōth*, "weeping") on the goddess, one of whose many titles may have become corrupted into something like Tammuz.

That the sun-worship described in verse 16 is Babylonian rather than north Arabian, or north Arabian rather than Babylonian, it would be difficult to prove, while neither from Babylonian nor (so far as we know it) from north Arabian religion can we account for the "putting the branch to the nose" in verse 17. Years ago (1888), in my small book on Jeremiah, I gave my adhesion to the view that the practice referred to is Persian—a bundle (called *baresman*) of branches of certain flowering trees was held before the face by worshippers that their breath might not contaminate the

glory of the sun. But apart from the improbability of the word *sholehim* just here, verse 17 seems clearly to express the climax of Israel's offences, and that climax is not connected with ritual but with ordinary morality. And most probably, as I have pointed out elsewhere,¹ it is one of those fearfully common sins against women's purity (Deut. xxii. 23), which is referred to in this closing passage.

Our work, however, is not yet done. We have not yet sufficiently answered the question, In which of the popular cults of Zedekiah's time can the religious influence of Babylon or of north Arabia be recognized? We have explored the dark corners of Ezekiel viii.; is there any further help to be derived from chapter ix.? This passage contains a terrible imaginative account of the massacre of the wicked inhabitants of Jerusalem by seven heavenly semi-divine beings in human form. One of the seven is clothed in linen; linen represents the luminous appearance of the divine body. The same great Being is said to have a writer's inkhorn at his side (v. 2). According to Gunkel and Zimmermann,² this is a Hebraized form of Nabû (Nebo), the Babylonian writer-god (cf. Enoch in the later Hebrew writings), by whom the destinies of men were written down on the heavenly tablets, and who was also one of the seven planetary deities. Certainly the parallelism is too obvious to be disregarded. But we must not, in my opinion, forget two other important parallelisms with Exodus xii. 23 and Daniel x. 5 respectively. In the former passage (cf. 2 Sam. xxiv. 16) "the destroyer" is clearly that warlike supernatural Being generally called Mal'ak-Yahweh and sometimes Mal'ak (for which most give as equivalents, "the Angel of Yahweh" and "the Angel," but, as I venture to think, wrongly), a Being believed in probably by the north Arabians before

¹ *Critica Biblica*, p. 95.

² *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, p. 404.

He became known to the Israelites. In the latter (as is also said in the Talmud) the man clothed in linen is Gabriel, who is but a faint copy of Mika'el (Michael), a Mighty One who has the same origin as Mal'ak,¹ i.e. is primarily north Arabian. And I cannot for my part suppose that such a personage, the Helper of the great God, was provided with fresh Babylonian characteristics, belonging properly to Nabû, in the time of Ezekiel. I admit, of course, the affinity of many points in the Babylonian and other Western Asiatic religions, but I do not feel it necessary to assume that when two religions have points in common one of the two must necessarily be the original of the other. Babylon may from time to time have directly influenced Israelitish religion, but upon the whole the popular religion borrowed much more from north Arabia, and the origin of north Arabian religion is not at present a subject ripe for discussion.

T. K. CHEYNE.

THE HEAVENLY TEMPLE AND THE HEAVENLY ALTAR.

II.

THE previous article closed with a survey of some Babylonian conceptions. That survey appeared to show: (1) that certain Babylonian temples were believed to have been constructed from plans revealed by the gods; (2) that the temples (in some cases at least) were regarded as a symbol of the cosmos, types, to use an older method of speech, of which the whole cosmos was the anti-type; but (3) that evidence appears to be wanting that the Babylonians believed in a temple and altar in heaven, or that the earthly temples and altars were copies of such particular heavenly originals; the anti-type of the earthly temple with its altar

¹ See EXPOSITOR, April, 1906.

was not a temple in heaven, but heaven itself or rather the entire cosmos.

If we now return to Jewish literature, we shall find close parallels to these Babylonian ideas.

Gudea's dream of the gods revealing to him the plan in accordance with which he subsequently builds his temple is paralleled in the Old Testament by the vision of Ezekiel (Ezek. xl.-xliii.) in which he is brought by the hand of Yahweh from Babylon to Mount Zion; for in this vision Ezekiel sees standing on Mount Zion "the likeness of the structure of a city,"¹ by which is meant, as the sequel shows, the likeness of the actual temple, which is in future to rise on Mount Zion, together with the enclosed temple area and the subsidiary buildings. As Gudea sees a man who proves to be a god drawing the plan of a temple on a tablet, so Ezekiel sees "a man whose appearance was like bronze," an angelic being, with a line and a measuring rod in his hand. This man exhorts Ezekiel to observe carefully what he sees that he may subsequently declare it to the House of Israel, and then proceeds to measure in detail the dimensions of the temple, the courts, the chambers for the priests and so forth. After the measurements have been completed, Ezekiel sees the glory of Yahweh advancing from the east and entering the temple, and then hears the voice of Yahweh speaking from within the temple to him; Yahweh's words close with the command, "And do thou, son of man, show the house of Israel the temple, its form and its pattern . . . describe the temple, its construction, its exits and its entrances, and make known to them all its forms, ordinances and regulations; write them down in their sight, that they may observe and perform all its ordinances."²

¹ Ezek. xl. 2, במבנה עיר.

² Ezek. xliii. 10, 11, Toy's translation; in ver. 10 for וּמְדַרְּו אֶת־תְּבִנִית read (with the LXX.) וּמְרָאוֹ וְתִבְנִיתוֹ; and in ver. 11 for וְצִוְּרָתָּ read וְצִוְּרָתָּ.

The account given in Exodus (P) of the origin of the tabernacle is similar, though in detail less clear and explicit. Moses is there said to have constructed the tabernacle and its appurtenances according to the *tabnith*, i.e. the build, pattern or plan, which Yahweh showed him while he was with Him on Mount Sinai (Exod. xxv. 9, 40). In another passage (xxvi. 30) Moses is instructed to build the tabernacle according to its *mishpat* which was "shown" him in the mountain. The *mishpat*, the common Hebrew word for custom, law, judgment, manner, etc., may *possibly* here mean something visible; but even if it does, we cannot say precisely what sort of visible thing it was. In any case the narrative, though it contains a sufficiently complete and detailed statement of what Moses was to make, that is to say, though it reports fully enough the verbal instructions of Yahweh to Moses, really leaves us in some doubt as to precisely what He showed him or how He showed it. Was it a model, as some assume, or was it rather a building-plan?

This vagueness in Exodus may perhaps be attributed to the fact that the writer is dealing with an already familiar idea; he is not the first to write of a temple constructed according to a *tabnith* revealed by God, nor does he write for those to whom such an idea is strange. How had he and his readers become familiar with the idea? Through the study of Ezekiel?

In Ezekiel we have precision where in Exodus we have vagueness or allusiveness. Ezekiel's account is so precise that it is not *necessary* to assume that he is working a long familiar idea; he presents it, as the creator of such an idea might present it. At the same time the possibility and even the probability that Ezekiel is here influenced by Babylonian ideas may be admitted on these grounds: (1) that he shows elsewhere much openness to the influence of his Babylonian surroundings; (2) that the belief in temples

built according to plans given from heaven is known to have existed in Babylon. The force of (2) would, of course, be greatly increased by the discovery of Babylonian narratives of temples so built of more recent date than Gudea's inscriptions (c. 3000 B.C.), or by proof that Ezekiel is likely to have been acquainted with statues of Gudea,¹ and the contents of the inscriptions.

One thing is clear and must be expressly noted : neither Ezekiel nor Moses is represented in the Old Testament as having seen a temple in heaven ; nor are the buildings which they are bidden to have constructed represented as being earthly copies of buildings that played any part in the life and society of heaven.

The third and last Old Testament narrative that shows the influence of the particular idea with which we are at present dealing is 1 Chronicles xxviii. 11-20. According to Kings (i. v. vii. 13 ff.), Solomon constructed the temple by the help of Tyrian workmen ; according to Chronicles he constructed it in accordance with plans (תבנית) given to him by David, who in turn had received them in writing from the hand of Yahweh. The interpretation of Chronicles has its own difficulties ; but so much seems clear (1) whether or not the account in Exodus of the God-given plans for the tabernacle is dependent on Ezekiel, the narrative in Chronicles presupposes that of Exodus ; (2) the *tabnith* or plan (and the words used in Exodus xxv. 9 and 1 Chronicles xxviii. 11, 12, 19 are the same) according to which Solomon built the temple, though shown and imparted by God, is something that passes from human hand to hand—whether model or plan matters little ; it is something that may have come from heaven, but remains on earth ; from which (3) we may probably infer that the Chronicler thought that the

¹ On one of these a building plan is engraved ; see the reproduction in Jeremias' *Das A. T. im Lichte des Alten Orients*², p. 593, Fig. 207.

tabnith of the tabernacle was not only shown to Moses on the Mount, but that it was also brought down by him and constantly referred to in constructing the tabernacle—and in this it is not unlikely that the Chronicler interpreted Exodus correctly.

We come now to Jewish parallels to the Babylonian interpretation of temples as symbols of the cosmos.

Passing over such possibilities as that the *'ohel mo'ed*, or "tent of meeting," indicates by its name that it was originally a symbol of that chamber of assembly in the world-mountain in which the gods met to determine destinies,¹ or that the "molten sea" of the Solomonic temple which was supported on twelve oxen, three facing each point of the compass, was, like the *apsu* of the Babylonian temples, a symbol of the Deep, we find at a very much later period interpretations of the temple that unquestionably attribute to its several parts or to its contents a cosmic symbolism. The earliest of these interpretations is Philo's and the next that of Josephus. Later Jewish and Christian interpretations we may pass over; they are probably derived from Philo and Josephus, and in any case only bear fuller evidence to the extent of this interpretation.

In the course of his discussion Philo clearly indicates that this cosmic principle of interpretation was not originated by himself; for with reference to a particular detail he disputes the correctness of the way in which it has been applied. Thus speaking of the cherubim on the ark, he says: "Some say that these, in virtue of their position face to face, are symbols of the two hemispheres, of that which is under the earth and that which is above it; for the whole heaven is a winged thing. But I should say"²—and

¹ See the cautious suggestion of Zimmern in *Die Keilinschriften u. das AT.*, p. 592.

² ταυτα δέ τινες μὲν φασιν εἶναι σύμβολα τῶν ἡμισφαιρίων ἀμφοῖν κατὰ τὴν ἀντιπρόσωπον θέσιν, τοῦ τε ὑπὸ γῆν καὶ ὑπὲρ γῆν· πτηνὸν γὰρ ὁ σύμπας οὐρανὸς ἐγὼ δ' ἂν εἴποιμι κ.τ.λ. *De Vita Moysis*, ii. (iii.) 8, Mangey, 150.

then he goes on to give his own explanation that these cherubim symbolize the creative and the royal powers of God.

Philo's interpretation extends over a large part of Book ii. (iii.) of the *De Vitâ Mosis*, and is far too lengthy to quote or discuss in detail here. It will suffice to note one or two points.

1. He differs entirely from the standpoint of the interpolator of the Apocalypse of Baruch (iv. 2-6) cited in the last article ; for he quite definitely and categorically denies that Moses on Sinai saw any material pattern of the tabernacle. What he saw, he saw with the mind (*τῇ ψυχῇ*), and what he beheld was "the incorporeal ideas of the corporeal things that were to be brought to completion" (*τῶν μελλόντων ἀποτελεῖσθαι σωμάτων ἀσωμάτων ιδέας*—Book II. c. iii., Mangey, 146). Philo obviously deduced no belief in a temple in heaven from the narrative in Exodus.

2. A passage in the *De Monarchiâ* (Mangey, 222) carries us further, and shows us that Philo had no room in his scheme of things for belief in a temple in heaven. He knows but two temples : one the temple made with hands ; the other the entire universe. His mode of expression perhaps indicates that he, like the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is in passing refuting a current belief. "It is right," he says, "to regard the entire cosmos as constituting the true and highest sanctuary of God ; the holiest part of the essence of existing things is the innermost chamber of this sanctuary ; the stars are its *anathemata* ; the angels ministers of His power, incorporeal souls, are its priests. But the other (sanctuary) is made with hands."¹

3. In view of this last passage it is a little curious that

¹ Τὸ μὲν ἀνωτάτω καὶ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν ἱερὸν θεοῦ νομίζειν τὸν σύμπαντα χρηὶ κόσμον εἶναι, πρὸς μὲν ἔχοντα τὸ ἀγιώτατον τῆς τῶν ὄντων οὐσίας μέρος, οὐρανόν, ἀναθήματα δὲ τοὺς ἀστερας ἱερείας δὲ τοὺς ὑποδιακόνους αὐτοῦ τῶν δυνάμεων ἀγγέλους, ἀσωμάτων ψυχάς . . . τὸ δὲ χειρόκμητον.

Philo does not explain the main divisions of the temple cosmically. His explanation of these is that the court represents the objects of sense (*τὰ αἰσθητά*), the sanctuary the objects of thought (*τὰ νοητά*). He retains the more distinctly cosmic interpretation for the accessories, especially the high priests' garment which symbolizes air, earth, water, heaven, and in particular the two hemispheres and the twelve signs of the Zodiac.

On the whole we appear to have in Philo a free and fresh use of a general principle of interpretation which he had inherited. But his attitude is of importance as showing that a cosmical interpretation of the earthly temple, so far from being intimately and necessarily connected with the belief in the existence of a temple in heaven, easily and naturally leads to the rejection of that belief if offered for acceptance.

Certain details that appear in Philo reappear in Josephus, but Josephus interprets the parts of the tabernacle also cosmically. "If any one will consider," he says, "the structure of the tabernacle . . . he will find that the several parts have been framed to imitate and represent the universe (*τὰ ὅλα*) . . . The tabernacle . . . was divided into three parts: two of these he left open to all the priests, as an ordinary and common place, and so indicated the earth and the sea, for these are accessible to all; the third portion he confined to God alone, because the heaven is also inaccessible to men." He then goes on to point out, for example, that the seven candles of the candlestick correspond to the seven planets, that the fabrics of which the veil was woven signify earth, air, fire and water; the breastplate in the middle of the ephod is the earth, "for the earth occupies the mid-most place"; the girdle the ocean, for it embraces the world, and so forth.¹

¹ *Ant.* iii. 7, 7; and similarly of Herod's temple, *Bell. Jud.*, v. 5, 4-7.

Philo the Alexandrian and Josephus the Palestinian were both apologists for their race and religion to the Græco-Roman world of their day, and it is probable that they made use of this cosmic interpretation because it served their apologetic purpose. What may have been the origin of that interpretation among the Jews, how far in principle and detail it may have been derived from Babylonian thought, it would be beyond the scope of this article to inquire further.

I have now completed the survey of the ideas that have been or might be considered to be most closely related to that idea of the temple and altar in heaven which we find fully developed in the apocalypse of John and which was the object of much interest to later Jewish thinkers. As a result of this survey it appears that Babylonian literature contains no explicit reference to an altar in heaven, and that any references which may perhaps be interpreted of a great house of the gods in heaven imply an idea which may be and possibly is radically different from that in the Apocalypse.

A favourite method with the scholars who, in spite of the failures that must beset pioneers, have done good service in seeking for Babylonian influence in Hebrew literature, is to fill up missing links in Babylonian mythology by inferences back from Hebrew thought and literature. The method in itself is not illegitimate, but needs to be pursued with caution. It cannot, I think, be safely adopted with the idea under discussion. We cannot, that is to say, safely argue: the Babylonians must have believed in a temple and an altar in heaven because the ancient and all-prevailing doctrine of correspondence of heaven and earth implies such a belief, and Jewish literature proves that this particular implication was understood and explicitly believed and stated. We cannot safely argue thus; for the fact that

the temples were built as symbols of the cosmos, or being built were so interpreted, is a *sufficient* deduction from the general principle of the correspondence of things earthly and heavenly for any one people or age to have drawn. The same general principle, it is true, might readily also lead to the argument—there is a temple on earth, and therefore there must be a temple in heaven ; but this argument would only suggest itself naturally to minds which had never entertained the belief that the temple on earth, or a part of it, was a representation of heaven, or to minds in which that belief was no longer vivid. It is significant that Philo and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who interpret the earthly temple cosmically, reject the belief in a temple in heaven—the former certainly, the latter probably. This was one course to adopt when the two deductions independently made from the same general principle met, as they did in the first century A.D. in the Jewish world. The other course, so often adopted in similar cases, of harmonizing mutually incompatible or ill-fitting beliefs may have been adopted by others, but I do not think we have an actual instance of this.

Once the belief in a temple in heaven had arisen the general doctrine of the correspondence of things earthly and heavenly would tend to give colour and elaboration to the new belief, such as the later Rabbinic literature shows that it did actually receive. But we have still, if possible, to discover the genesis of the belief. Neither direct evidence nor sound inference encourages us to seek for this in Babylonia. It is therefore reasonable at least to consider how far we can explain the belief as of native Jewish origin ; and here our first step is to determine the limits of time within which it originated. This brings us back to the interpretation of Isaiah chap. vi. If Isaiah refers to the heavenly temple, the idea in his day was already

a familiar one and probably long current ; but if he refers to the earthly temple, then we shall have no *evidence* of the Jewish belief in a heavenly temple earlier than the close of the second century B.C., and we shall have to consider how long the belief is likely to have existed before our earliest evidence of its existence.

To what then does Isaiah refer ? I shall content myself with indicating one or two of the chief considerations which lead me to the conclusion that Isaiah refers to the earthly temple ; and these shall be such as will retain their force even if some day we get proof direct and unambiguous that the Babylonians, or the Hebrew contemporaries of Isaiah, believed in the existence of a heavenly temple and altar.

One word first as to an intermediate interpretation. The term used by Isaiah and commonly rendered " temple " is *הֵיכָל*, which also and even primarily means " palace " ; accordingly some interpreters claim that it was not a heavenly *temple*, but a heavenly *palace* that Isaiah saw. But this will not do ; the allusion to the altar in verse 6 clearly proves that the scene of Isaiah's vision is sacred and not merely royal.

The issue then is clear : either the temple of the vision is the temple on Mount Zion,¹ or the vision of Isaiah proves that the idea of the altar and temple in heaven is eight centuries earlier than the apocalypse of John.

As a matter of fact the temple and altar of the vision are the temple and altar on Mount Zion. Even if the idea of a heavenly temple not only existed in the age of Isaiah, but was one with which he was familiar, he, as an inhabitant of Jerusalem, was far more familiar with the actual temple.

¹ This would remain true if we were to revive Rashi's interpretation of Isa. vi. 1 : " I saw Him sitting on His throne in heaven, and His feet in the *hēkal*, the footstool of His feet, i.e., in the sanctuary " (cf. Isa. lxxv. 1).

When, therefore, he speaks of "the altar" and "the temple" without any qualification or explanation, it is at the least more probable that he is referring to the more familiar objects, unless anything in the narrative unmistakably suggests the contrary. I recall here that both in the Testament of Levi and in the Apocalypse of John the writers are careful, when speaking of the temple in heaven, to make it quite clear that it is this temple and not the earthly of which they speak. It has been urged that the presence of the seraphim is a sufficient indication that the scene is in heaven; but this is by no means so; if Elisha's servant, when his eyes were opened, saw horses and chariots of fire (2 Kings vi. 17) in Dothan, Isaiah, with eyes open in vision, might well see seraphim in Jerusalem.¹ It is indeed the very fact that he sees Yahweh holding court in Jerusalem that gives full point to his alarm; it is the actual presence of the Holy One of Israel in the midst of Israel and not remote in heaven that spells doom to the unclean people; the sinners in Sion must needs be alarmed (cf. Isa. xxxiii. 4f.).

Again, the analogy of the vision of Amos favours interpreting the temple that Isaiah saw as the temple on Mount Zion. "I saw the Lord," says Amos, "standing beside the altar; and He said, Smite the chapiters that the thresholds may quake, and cut them off on to the head of them all" (Amos ix. 1). The temple whose thresholds are to quake and whose falling chapiters are to descend on the heads of the assembled worshippers is certainly not the heavenly temple, but the temple at Bethel, the great sanctuary of the kingdom whose destruction Amos has to announce. Again, in Ezekiel's vision, which it is generally admitted shows some dependence on that of Isaiah, the earthly temple is the spot where the prophet sees the glory of Yahweh revealed (Ezek. viii. 3, x. 4); though he sees heaven

¹ Cf. also Ezek. x. 3.

opened (i. 1), unlike John he sees no temple therein ; from the opened heaven he sees the chariot or moveable throne descending earthwards.

Isaiah, then, in his narrative of his vision, does not refer to a temple in heaven.

If the belief in a heavenly temple and altar could have been shown to exist in Israel in the eighth century B.C., the *origin* of the belief would remain, so far as I can see, obscure. We might *conjecture* that it came from Babylon ; but as we have seen the evidence actually offered for the existence of the belief in Babylon is invalid ; and were it otherwise, the origin of the Babylonian belief would still need to be explained. If, however, this belief arose among the Jews at a later date than Isaiah, a probable cause for it may be assigned.

From the fact that there is no direct evidence for the existence of the belief earlier than the Testaments of the Patriarchs at the end of the second century B.C., coupled with the fact that neither Ezekiel nor P nor the Chronicler refers to the heavenly temple, though it would have been exceedingly natural for them to do so if they were familiar with it, I infer that the date of origin lies between 500 and 100 B.C.

What then gave birth to the idea ? Some have traced it back to an inference or development from the narratives in Exodus, which rest on the belief, common to Babylon and Israel, that temples were built according to a ground-plan or the like received from heaven. Thus, for example, Dr. Charles writes : “ Of the existence of heavenly antitypes of the Tabernacle and its furniture we are told already in the Priests’ Code (Exod. xxv. 9, 40 ; cf. Heb. viii. 5). It needed only a step further to postulate the existence of the heavenly temple and city.” And again : “ Since, according to Exodus xxv. 9, 40 ; Numbers viii. 4, the earthly altar

and tabernacle were made after the likeness of heavenly patterns or originals . . . the idea of a sacrificial service in heaven must have been familiar to Judaism long before the composition of the Testaments.”¹

The term “heavenly pattern or original” is ambiguous; it may mean an object which remains and continues to be used in heaven, after an imitation of it has been made and is in use on earth; or it may mean a pattern, plan, model or what-not that is given from heaven to guide the construction of an object to be used on earth, a pattern, that is to say, of something that is to be made on earth, but not of anything that either has been or is to be in heaven. I believe, for reasons already given, that the *tabnith* of Exodus xxv. 9 and the *mar'eh* of Numbers viii. 4 were heavenly originals only in the latter sense. Moses on Mount Sinai saw neither altar nor tabernacle, but merely plans according to which the earthly altar and tabernacle were to be built; moreover the narrative in Exodus does not assert that Moses either ascended into heaven or saw into heaven, and the analogy of Ezekiel's vision makes it very precarious to *infer* that he did either; what he saw, he saw on the mount.

Although I do not deny that the passages in Exodus may have had *some* part in creating or fostering the belief in a heavenly temple and altar, I think it precarious to infer from them that this belief existed *long* before the time of the Testaments. So long as the *tabnith* of Exodus continued to be understood, as it apparently still was by the Chronicler,² of

¹ *Apocalypse of Baruch*, note on iv. 3, and *Test. of the Patriarchs*, note on “Levi,” iii. 5.

² And probably by the LXX, though the words used by them (*παράδειγμα* and *τύπος*) have a sufficient range of meanings in Greek to allow of the translators having understood the passages to mean rather more than, as has been argued above, they were intended to express. In Exod. xxv. 9 (8) the LXX renders *καὶ ποιήσεις μοι κατὰ πάντα ὅσα σοι δεικνύω ἐν τῷ ὄρει τὸ παράδειγμα τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ τὸ παράδειγμα πάντων τῶν σκευῶν αὐτῆς, οὕτω ποιήσεις*. In ver. 40, though the Hebrew again has *תבנית*, the Greek rendering is

a building plan, it obviously formed no suitable object for a heavenly priesthood to offer sacrifices upon, still less could it create a belief in a heavenly priesthood.

If, then, we cannot safely argue from Exodus that the belief in the heavenly altar existed "*long*" before the Testaments, how far can we go? It would be a reasonable inference that it existed some time before the "Testaments" (i.e., c. 107 B.C.), if that form of the text of Levi iii. 6 is earliest which reads: "In it (i.e., the highest heaven) are the archangels, who minister and make propitiation to the Lord for all the sins of ignorance of the righteous, offering to the Lord a sweet-smelling savour, a reasonable and bloodless offering." For this piling up of sacrificial terms suggests a heavenly priesthood and a heavenly altar; the inference would be less secure, if the shorter text be original which says merely, "And the hosts of angels are ministering and praising the Lord: who also are messengers of the Godhead." At best, then, we are only justified in placing

ὅρα ποιήσεις κατὰ τὸν τύπον τὸν δεδειγμένον σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει. In Num. viii. 4, where the Hebrew has מִצָּנִיחַ, the Greek gives εἶδος. Both παράδειγμα and τύπος are rare in the LXX; παράδειγμα elsewhere occurs only in 1 Chron. xxviii. (six times—4 times = Π'Ι'Ι'Π and twice in the same sense, where it has no equivalent in Hebrew), in Nahum. iii. 6. = 'ΝΓ, R.V. "a gazingstock," and, with a similar sense, as a euphemistic rendering of ἴδιον, "dung," in Jer. viii. 2, ix. 22 (21), xvi. 4; it also occurs in 3 Macc. ii. 5, 4 Macc. vi. 19. Τύπος occurs again only in Amos v. 26 (= Δ'Υ) and in 3 Macc. iii. 30, 4 Macc. vi. 19. Of uses of παράδειγμα outside the LXX it is of interest to recall two; in Herod. v. 62 (τὸν τε νῆον ἐξεργάσαντο τοῦ παραδείγματος κάλλιον), the sense must closely resemble that of παράδειγμα and Π'Ι'Ι'Π alike in 1 Chron. xxviii. The other use is Plato's at the end of the 9th book of the "Republic." I cite the passage fully for its interesting though *superficial* resemblance to some of the Jewish ideas discussed in the article: "The man of understanding . . . will consent to interfere in politics . . . You mean, in the city whose organization we have now completed, and which is confined to the region of speculation; for I do not believe that it is to be found anywhere on earth . . . Well, said I, perhaps in heaven there is laid up a pattern of it (παράδειγμα ἀνέκειται) for him who wishes to behold it, and beholding to organize himself accordingly. And the question of its present or future existence on earth is quite unimportant, for in any case he will adopt the practices of such a city" (Davies' and Vaughan's translation).

the belief in a heavenly sacrificial service, and, by inference, the belief in a heavenly altar, *some* indefinite time before the Testaments.

If we seek an upward limit for the origin of the belief, we are reduced from the nature of the case to determining when the argument from silence acquires force. I have already suggested that the failure of the belief to appear in three writers, Ezekiel, P and the Chronicler, all of whom had good reason for betraying it if they held it, should receive due weight. Is the belief younger also than the early parts of the book of Enoch? The argument from silence in this case would be much more precarious; still it is interesting to observe that instead of the souls of the dead that cry to God lying under the heavenly altar as in John's Apocalypse, they are on earth or in Sheol (Enoch chap. ix. xxii.); and the heavenly house which Enoch describes is a *palace* rather than a *temple*: "All the portals stood open before me, and it was built of flames of fire, and in every respect it so excelled in splendour and magnificence and extent that I cannot describe to you its splendour and its extent. And its floor was fire, and above it were lightnings, and the path of the stars, and its ceiling also was a flaming fire. And I looked and saw therein a lofty throne; its appearance was as a hoar frost, its circuit was a shining sun and the voices of cherubim. And from underneath the great throne came streams of flaming fire, so that it was impossible to look thereon. And the great Glory sat thereon, and His raiment shone more brightly than the sun and was whiter than any snow."¹ This is the throne-room of the Most High in heaven—in a word His palace. We move here in that circle of ideas which led the Hebrew writers to speak of heaven itself as God's palace (דִּיכָל), or dwelling (זְבוּל), or of his palace in heaven (Ps. xi. 4, xviii. 7; Mic.

¹ Enoch xiv. 14 ff. (Charles's translation).

i. 2; Heb. ii. 20; Isa. lxiii. 15). The **היכל** in these cases has often been translated "temple," but "palace" is preferable; in Psalm xxix., for example, Yahweh sits enthroned (as in Enoch) in His heavenly **היכל** or palace, and the "sons of the gods" prostrate themselves before Him as His greatest officers prostrate themselves before an earthly monarch sitting in state.

The author of Enoch may have borrowed points in his description of the heavenly palace from the narratives of Isaiah vi. and Ezekiel i. without locating the scene of either Isaiah's or Ezekiel's vision in heaven, or locating Isaiah's there he may have ignored the altar, just as modern commentators who have turned the temple into a palace have done. Not so later writers. For I believe that Isaiah's vision, although it does not itself refer to the heavenly temple and altar, was a main cause in producing the belief in them. If many later scholars have mistakenly interpreted Isaiah vi., it is not surprising if Jewish scholars of the second or third centuries B.C. did so. In an age when Jewish writers commonly imagined their heroes making journeys through heaven, curious to know the meaning of everything and generally finding an angel ready to satisfy their curiosity, nothing is more probable than that, as they read the story of Isaiah's vision, they imagined that he too, like one of their heroes, had been caught up into heaven. If so, sooner or later the altar of the story attracted their attention, and the belief in the heavenly altar was born; and then, if not before, the heavenly palace became, or received as its fellow, the heavenly temple.

This influence of Isaiah vi. appears to me significantly reflected both in the Testaments and in the Apocalypse of John, our earliest documents that clearly and unmistakably refer to the temple in heaven.

“ I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne high and lifted up, and His robe filled the temple ”—the words are Isaiah’s. “ The angel opened to me the gate of heaven, and I saw the holy temple, and upon a throne of glory the Most High ”—the spectator is Levi in the Testaments. And lastly John writes : “ And one of the four living creatures gave unto the seven angels, seven golden bowls full of the wrath of God. . . . And the temple was filled with smoke . . . and I heard a great voice out of the temple of God, saying, Go ye and pour out the seven bowls of the wrath of God into the earth ” ; and then later, “ and there came forth a voice out of the temple from the throne, saying, It is done.” Additional points of contact with Isaiah in John are the house filling with smoke and the voice from the throne uttering the sentence of doom.

My conclusions on the whole matter briefly summarized are these : with the evidence at present existing it is far more probable that the idea of a temple in heaven and of an altar attached with a heavenly priesthood offering sacrifices on it is of native Jewish development than that it is of Babylonian origin ; this particular development of Jewish thought took place between about 500 and 100 B.C., and probably very considerably nearer the later than the earlier limit ; and in it we may see one of the early fruits of that learned and speculative exegesis of the Old Testament which is represented first in the Apocalyptic literature and later in the various Haggadic products of the Rabbinical schools.

G. BUCHANAN GRAY.

“ THOU HAST FAITH AND I HAVE WORKS ”

(JAMES II. 18).

THE writer of the Epistle of James in the latter part of his second chapter is engaged in impressing upon his readers (who, so far as what he says is concerned, might be any Christians anywhere) the obligation not to lie down in indolent reliance on their membership in the Christian Church, but to show the works of mercy and justice and a good life, without which justification and salvation cannot be hoped for. “ Faith without works,” he says, “ is dead.”

“ But,” he goes on, “ some one will say, Thou hast faith and I have works,” and to this he seems to reply, “ Show me thy faith without thy works and I will show thee my faith by my works.” And so the argument proceeds with telling force against the lax believers who imagine that they can relinquish moral effort because they have once become Christians.

The main lines of the argument are clear enough ; and the only serious problems in the greater part of the passage are as to the circumstances which called out this earnest exhortation, and as to how much and what theological reflection and formulation on the subject of faith and justification had preceded it—in a word, as to the relation of the discussion to the Epistles of Paul to the Romans and Galatians.

But in verse 18, embedded in this argument, is to be found one of the most puzzling *cruces* of New Testament exegesis. ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις Σὺ πίστιν ἔχεις καὶ γὰρ ἔργα ἔχω, *But some one will say, Thou hast faith and I have works.* In the study of this sentence three main questions arise :

1. What kind of a person is meant by “ some one ” (τις) ?

2. What is this person driving at by the interjected remark which he is supposed to make, and how much of this

and the following verse ought to be assigned to his shadowy lips ?

3. Whom does he mean by "thou" and whom by "I" ?

In the exegesis there are various possible combinations of interrogative and positive sentences and parts of sentences. And, besides these, various exegetical theories have been propounded whereby the one important point which could alone make the sentence convey the writer's meaning is supposed to have been deliberately omitted ; not to mention other theories, such as von Hofmann used to delight in, "rag-time hypotheses," as we might call them, which by putting the emphasis on the obviously unemphatic word try to extract from the text a meaning which it was clearly and evidently not meant to convey.

Perhaps, however, before looking at the verse more closely, two remarks on common errors may be permitted.

First, it is important to remember that James is not discussing or defining Faith. Many of the interpreters talk about him as if he were a scholastic theologian to whom faith was a *concept*, and who had been engaged all his life in whittling down that concept like a lead-pencil to just the right degree of symmetry and pointedness.

I cannot help thinking that the acute and sympathetic Professor Bacon is at least on the edge of falling into this condemnation in an interesting article in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* for 1900. He there seems to represent the author, whom for convenience we may call James, as composing our passage in consequence of the impression produced on his mind by reading the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and as "aiming to correct a type of ultra-Paulinism to which Hebrews, unless wisely interpreted, would be likely to give aid and comfort" (p. 16), or, again, as "antagonizing" a "type of ultra-Pauline intellectualism" (p. 17).

Now the correctness of this representation of the method of thought and motive of the Epistle to the Hebrews is itself doubtful. We can hardly suppose that writer to have thought that he was defining Christian faith in any such sense as that in which a modern builder of theological systems defines his concepts. Faith was an objective fact. Paul had not invented it, the author to the Hebrews could not alter it, whether by enlargement or diminution. In its essence and kernel and inner reality it was as nearly the same for Paul, for him, and for James as their very different temperaments would allow any psychological experience to be. What Paul had done was to point out the implications and results and significance of faith, to signalize it as supreme, and to show how, if men will but use it, it will carry them on to heights of character and depths of divine experience that only those who are "in Christ Jesus" can know. What the writer to the Hebrews had done was to philosophize about this same faith, to try to show himself that it is the centre of a rational system, possible for a thinking man who stands at any rate on the verge of the high ground of contemporary philosophy. Having worked out for himself a coherent body of thought on the subject he uses that body of thought to portray the unique position of Christianity in the universe. His hymn to faith has not reduced Christian faith to mere "insight" and "enlightenment," as is sometimes affirmed, but presents it as the crown and summit of all human faith, comprehensible just because it is not isolated but related. And this faith is not disparaged and made common, but is shown forth in its glorious uniqueness, by the long series of heroes of faith, the greatest and brightest of the past, who yet did not receive that better thing reserved for us, which is given through Jesus, the author and perfecter of faith.

Considering the strong practical motive with which the author to the Hebrews wrote, it would surely have surprised

him to be told that any one could consider his homily an encouragement to moral laxity. He wrote, with an unrelaxing severity which is actually a stumbling-block to a theology built on the New Testament, of the irreparable loss of those who fall away, and of God as a consuming fire, and his tract is not deficient in specific moral precepts. That a church of pleasure-loving and easily discouraged people like those whom James has in mind could be drawn into an easy and careless life by the Epistle to the Hebrews is, to me at least, inconceivable.

For that is the type of man James has in mind,—people such as those whom we know nowadays, fair-weather Christians, whose idea of God is in danger of degenerating to hardly more than a good Santa Claus, and so stands them in little stead when trouble comes, believers who rely on church-membership to pull them through in the Day of Judgment, and are glad in the meantime to live in the world and of it, not doers but hearers and talkers, truckling to the rich and great, quarrelling over their supposed wisdom, making pleasure and not God their aim, and in consequence bringing themselves and their neighbours into every sort of conflict and petty warfare, aping the rich, who are not their true friends, forgetting that the grandest thing any man can do is to convert a sinner from the error of his way. All this is not founded on any theory of the nature of faith. It is doubtful whether anywhere or ever in the history of the world men who were serious enough to trouble themselves about a theory of the nature of faith were at the same time frivolous and profligate enough to take advantage of the moral licence to which a false theory might seem to entitle them. And James knew uncommonly well how to fit his argument to the practical needs of his readers.

We need then to avoid thinking that either verse 18 or the whole passage rests on any previous debate or reflection on

the nature of faith as a theological concept. The faith James means is just plain faith in Jesus Christ as Messiah and Lord. If a man believes that, he becomes a Christian, and may join the brotherhood of believers. James fails to see as necessarily involved in and resulting to the believer from this faith some things which Paul finds there, but the faith itself is the same thing.

Secondly. The second general remark can be made more briefly. We have in verse 18 a fragmentary dialogue. But it is not a real dialogue ; it is introduced by the author solely for his own purposes, and must be interpreted in such a way as to aid and not hinder the development of his main contention. Such fragmentary dialogues are very characteristic of Greek popular moral exhortation of this period. This is a point which is overlooked by many of the commentators, including, for instance, Weiss, who makes out that the words ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις introduce a decidedly disagreeable, not to say insulting, *argumentum ad hominem* addressed to the writer himself.

But we have delayed over long on preliminaries. Let us turn to our verse.

1. Who was τις ?

There are three chief theories on this point. Some hold that he was a defender of the persons addressed, whose defence is here stated clearly before it is met. This is the most natural explanation ; and 1 Corinthians xv. 35, " But some one will say (ἀλλὰ ἐρεῖ τις), How are the dead raised ? " presents a complete analogy, to which can be added Barnabas ix. 6 (ἀλλ' ἐρεῖς), 4 Maccabees ii. 24 (εἴποι τις ἄν), Romans ix. 19, xi. 19, and many other passages.

The only reason for doubting this explanation comes from the difficulty of understanding how such an opponent or defender could possibly be represented as saying to James, " Thou hast faith and I have works." The lack of works was

the very thing for which these people were blamed, and it is evident from what follows that this is no general denial of the allegation that the works are lacking.

Accordingly two other types of theory have been developed. One view holds that this mysterious τις is an ally (or even a kind of double) of James himself, coming to the rescue of the author. This seems to be the meaning intended by the English versions (A.V. and R.V.), "Yea, a man may [R.V. will] say." What has been said above ought to have made it plain that this is highly unlikely.

The other theory is that the "some one" is an outside non-Christian—whether heathen or Jew—who is held up in *terrorem* before the luckless representatives of laxity. "If you keep on," says James, "your hostile neighbour will be able to say, 'You claim a mysterious something you call faith. It does not show in works; where is it? As for me, on the other hand,' the neighbour will go on to say, 'my conduct—my works—shows that I have all the faith a man needs.' And to this hostile neighbour," says James, "you, my reader, will have no reply to make whatever."

There is something concrete and vital and attractive in this view, which has lately been urged with force and conviction by Zahn, but the supposed utterance is too much like the excuses of the unchurched, moral man of to-day, and this explanation can hardly be right. It is further exposed to the fatal objection that such a non-Christian neighbour could not be supposed to claim "faith" in James's sense.

2. How much of what follows is governed by ἐπεὶ?

The brief sentence of verse 18a, "Thou hast faith and I have works," is, if taken by itself, enigmatical, and hardly permits a decision as to the general drift of the interposed objection. If the rest of verse 18 is regarded as a part of the interjected utterance, the result is little better, so far as clearness is concerned; and there is the added difficulty

that verse 18b seems to challenge the correctness of "thou hast faith." If, however, verse 18b is understood to be James's reply to the objection of verse 18a, then James's contention becomes clear. The words, "Show me thy faith apart from thy works, and I by my works will show thee my faith," are plainly meant not to prove James's faith, which nobody questions, but to affirm that faith and works are *inseparable*. "You cannot have a sincere faith that does not show itself in works, and if a Christian can show works no one may justly doubt his faith."¹

If this is true, the nature of the interjected remark also becomes plain. That must have been an affirmation, reflected in verse 18b, that faith and works are *separable*. And that it is. Just as Paul says (1 Cor. xii. 8 ff.) that to one is given the word of wisdom, to another the word of knowledge, to another *faith*, and to another gifts of healing, the same Spirit dividing to each one severally as He will, so here this interposed objector is made to say, "Each man has his specialty; you have faith, I have works. There is a division of gifts and of responsibility, and James's harsh requirement that everybody shall have both faith and works is unjustified."

3. This paraphrase may have already suggested the explanation I would give of the puzzle which still remains in an otherwise perfectly clear passage. If the interposed objection is thought of as addressed to James, it seems to be affirmed that James has faith while the objector has works; whereas we should expect, if anything, the opposite. But is it in that sense addressed to James? It seems to me that *σὺ* and *ἐγώ*, *thou* and *I*, are in all probability merely a more picturesque mode of indicating two persons—as we might have *εἰς*, *ἕτερος*, *one*, *another*. This seems a natural mode of expression, and it perfectly suits the context.

¹ It should be needless to point out that of course the works of a *heathen* cannot attest *Christian* faith.

This interpretation has been held by at least two commentators, but has attracted little attention. Pott, in the third edition (1816) of his commentary on James in Koppe's New Testament, adopts it, and so does a Dutch commentator, H. Bouman, 1865.

A good example of nearly the same usage can be adduced from one of that class of writings which present the nearest analogy that we have in Greek literature to the Epistle of James, the diatribes of the popular philosophers. The cynic philosophic preacher, Teles (*circa* 240 B.C.), quoting his predecessor Bion, is urging that every man must play the part that Fortune assigns him, and says: *μὴ οὖν βούλου δευτερολόγος ὦν τὸ πρωτολόγου πρόσωπον· εἰ δὲ μή, ἀνάρμοστόν τι ποιήσεις. σὺ μὲν ἄρχεις καλῶς, ἐγὼ δὲ ἄρχομαι, φησί (sc. ὁ Βίων), καὶ σὺ μὲν πολλῶν, ἐγὼ δὲ ἑνὸς τουτουῦ παιδαγωγὸς γενόμενος, καὶ σὺ μὲν εὖπορος γενόμενος δίδως ἐλευθερίως, ἐγὼ δὲ λαμβάνω εὐθαρσῶς παρὰ σοῦ οὐχ ὑποπίπτων οὐδὲ ἀγεννίζων οὐδὲ μεμψιμοιρῶν* (*Teletis reliquiae*, ed. Hense, p. 3, from Stobæus, *Anthol.* iii. 1, 98 ([Meineke v. 67])).

"If, then, you are a second-class actor, don't envy the rôle of the first-class player. If you do, you will commit blunders. You are a ruler, I am a subject (he [sc. Bion] says); you have many under you, I, as a tutor, but this one; and you grow prosperous and give generously, while I cheerfully receive from you without fawning or lowering myself or complaining."

In the first sentence here quoted *σύ* is the man with the inferior actor's part. In the rest of the passage, on the other hand, *σύ* is the more prosperous man, in contrast to the speaker, who modestly presents himself as the representative of lesser worldly fortune. Somewhat similar is the way in which James (v. 18) fails to preserve strictly the rôles of the fragmentary dialogue.

This seems a more satisfactory explanation than the vio-

lent procedure of conjectural emendation (supported by one Latin manuscript)¹ which yields, "Thou hast works and I have faith." Moreover, the resulting text of the emendation is unsatisfactory. For James's own character and principles have not been brought into question in the discussion, and yet to represent the supposed defender of the persons deficient in works as here drawing a sharp contrast specifically between James and himself has the effect of making the words a direct attack on James as a man who lacks faith. It is hardly possible that James would have introduced this attack against himself. His sole purpose is to present clearly and sharply a possible excuse for the morally lax, in order that he may then summarily dispose of it.

One other interesting question arises, which, like all questions of its class, is hard to answer. Does, namely, the supposed objection imply a knowledge of and tendency to misuse the teaching of Paul, repeated in more than one passage of his epistles, about diversity of function in the Christian Church? This point does not seem to come out in the commentaries generally. I am inclined to think that, in view of the other probable allusions of James to misused Pauline formulas and ideas, this is also to be so understood. It should, however, always be observed, as is generally not observed, that it is by no means certain that the knowledge on which these allusions rest came either to the persons addressed by James or to the author of the Epistle, in Jerusalem or Antioch or wherever it was that he lived, through *written* media. He may well never have read the Epistles, and the persons he has in mind may never have seen them, and yet they may have been able to make this

¹ Pfleiderer, *Urchristenthum*, 1887, p. 874; 1902, ii. p. 547; Codex Corbeiensis (ff¹), *tu operam habes, ego fidem habeo*. See E. Y. Hincks, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xviii. 1899, pp. 199-202, where other conjectural emendations are discussed.

use of the Pauline ideas. For those ideas must have been often expressed, and they were not merely the product of the Epistles to the Corinthians and Romans, but were the source of those Epistles. That Paul was daily expressing his ideas in other modes than through his ten or thirteen preserved letters is a fact which is sometimes overlooked.

JAMES HARDY ROPES.

THE EXPANSION OF JERUSALEM.¹

“And I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and behold, a man with a measuring line in his hand. Then said I, Whither goest thou? And he said unto me, To measure Jerusalem, to see what should be the breadth thereof, and what should be the length thereof. And, behold, the angel that talked with me stood still, and another angel came forth to meet him; and he [i.e., the angel that talked with me] said unto him, Run, speak to yonder young man, saying, Jerusalem shall be inhabited as villages without walls, by reason of the multitude of men and cattle therein. For I, saith the Lord, will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and a glory will I be in the midst of her.”—*Zech.* ii. 1–5.

THE new Jerusalem was the problem of the hour: How was it to be built up? When were the prophecies to be fulfilled? A band of exiles had arrived from distant Babylon with great words ringing in their ears, great visions rising before their eyes. “Behold, I will set thy stones in fair colours, and lay thy foundations with sapphires. And I will make thy pinnacles of rubies and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy border of pleasant stones. And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord, and great shall be the peace of thy children.”² With words like these the Second Isaiah had kindled the hopes of the exiles. And then Ezekiel, after the destruction of the city and temple, had seen his vision as he lay by the waters of Babylon; he saw the temple rebuilt, furnished and ordered in minutest detail, and the

¹ The annual sermon on Messianic Prophecy preached before the University of Oxford, January 26, 1908.

² Isaiah liv. 11 ff.

holy city laid out around it; all was ready for Jehovah's return to His deserted shrine, and for the home-coming of His banished people. Presently the prophet saw the solemn entry of the Lord, the God of Israel, into the sanctuary by the eastern gate; "And behold, the glory of the Lord filled the house of the Lord; and I fell upon my face."¹ It was this vision which the returning exiles brought home with them to Jerusalem. The interest and the pathos of the situation are to be found in the dreams which filled the hearts of the faithful; and indeed at all times in a nation's history such aspirations and common hopes possess more significance than the bare realities. But how and when were the prophecies to be fulfilled? that was the urgent question; and the prophet Zechariah came forward with an answer. He too had his visions like the rest, and this is what he saw: a young man with a measuring line in his hand about to measure the ground-plan of the new Jerusalem. By the prophet's side there stood an angel-interpreter, just as Virgil or Beatrice stood beside Dante in his visions; and when another angel appeared upon the scene, the interpreter bade him run and stop the young man with the measuring line, and for this reason: the Jerusalem of the future was not to be rebuilt on the same lines as the Jerusalem of the past; no measurements would be needed for the new city was to be built upon a larger scale to make room for the large increase of its citizens; it was to lie open like an unwall'd town, capable of indefinite expansion; and as for defences, stone walls would not be needed, for Jehovah Himself would be a wall of fire round about, and His glorious presence would dwell within the city. Observe the fine mingling of the outward and the inward. The material fabric is not to be dissolved into a mere symbol or picture; there is to be a city, and it is to be inhabited by a multitude

¹ Ezek. xliv. 1 ff.

of men and cattle; but the material fabric is to be spiritualized, the circumference a wall of fire, the centre Jehovah's presence in glory; matter and spirit, human and divine, welded into one corporate whole. As we follow the track of the prophet's thought, we catch already a glimpse of the shining climax to which it leads.

But we must turn to the vision. There is the young man with the measuring line. He represents the narrow and mechanical interpretation of prophecy which led to sad disappointments and grievous loss in the history of Judaism, and is by no means extinct among us now. For it is a tendency in human nature to imagine that we can apply our human measurements to God's plan and purpose. Those Jewish exiles imagined that the future was simply to reproduce the past; the Jerusalem they had in their minds was the strong fortress which could resist attack, the guardian of the nation's throne and altar, wherein Israel might dwell secure from the heathen world outside. On these lines, then, the city was to be measured out; the first business was to see what should be the breadth thereof and what should be the length thereof.

But it was exactly this short-sighted view of the destiny of Israel which the interpreting angel hastened to correct. God's purpose was wider than men imagined; it could no longer be contained within the boundaries which had sufficed for earlier needs; God's city must be built without walls. There must be ample room for expansion, space for more citizens, for a wider franchise, for a bolder confidence in the future. And lest any man should be afraid to welcome this larger view, Jehovah Himself promised the defence of His encircling guard and the illumination of His abiding presence. Here, in this vision of Zechariah, we have presented to us in vivid contrast the rival elements in the faith of Israel, the temper which was always

in favour of setting up stone walls and living within them, and the temper which refused to be confined, and looked beyond and trusted God. These elements run deep in human nature; they need not be rivals, if we can once learn how to be both loyal to the past and open-minded towards the future, and how to maintain the material fabric, the outward institutions, for spiritual ends. But what we see in the history and literature of Israel which followed the age of Zechariah is the struggle between these opposing elements; the reconciliation was to come later.

The great truth impressed upon Zechariah by his vision was not entirely new; earlier prophets had encouraged the larger outlook and hailed the prospect of the expansion of Jerusalem. "Thine eyes shall see the King in his beauty, they shall behold a far-stretching land." The great unknown prophet of the return from Babylon had pictured the children of the new Jerusalem saying, "The place is too strait for me; give place to me that I may dwell"; he had exhorted them, "Lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes." But when it came to the point, disillusionment took the place of hope; the prophet's ardent dreams were not to be accomplished yet. In the century after Zechariah, we find Ezra organizing the Jewish community on the most exclusive principles, and Nehemiah setting to work at once to repair the walls of Jerusalem and collect the people within them for protection. So far from any thought of welcome for converted Gentiles, the main object of the religious leaders was to safeguard the community from heathen surroundings. Consolidation rather than expansion was the supreme necessity, if the Jewish faith and nation were to survive at all. In the centuries which followed, as the Persians succeeded to the Babylonians, and the Persians again gave place to the successors of Alexander, and Syria and Egypt fell under changing powers, sometimes friendly, some-

times hostile to the struggling little nation in Jerusalem—during this period the main religious tendencies were making for the preservation rather than the enlargement of the distinctive faith and practice of Judaism. It was the period when the faithful turned to the past for encouragement and idealized their ancient history, and studied the writings of the prophets, annotated and added to them, in a wistful effort to adjust their belief in God's particular providence to the non-fulfilment of His promise. At last, in the second century B.C., we come to the Book of Daniel, and what do we find? A life-and-death struggle going on between loyal Israelites and a wanton heathen persecutor of their religion. Death any day rather than eat the heathen meat, or profane the Sabbath, or sacrifice to idols, or neglect the hours of prayer! The spirit of martyrs and confessors is abroad! It is no narrow creed which such men champion. They have their wide outlook, their grasp of principles. They are convinced that no heathen powers can in the end prevail against God, that the truth is bound to triumph, and the kingdom of God be established. And they were bold enough to fix a date; in three-and-a-half years deliverance would come, and the reign of the holy people of God begin. So in former days the prophets had again and again expected, a great act of salvation was at hand, to be followed at once by the dawn of a glorious day. But no! it was not to be. The hour was not yet come.

The Book of Daniel is our one canonical specimen of a considerable body of literature which came into vogue at this period. We may see the beginnings of it in the visions of Zechariah, one of which we are trying to interpret. When the succession of prophets came to an end, their place was taken by the apocalyptic writers. The Jewish apocalypses reflect significantly the thoughts that were uppermost in the minds of the people. They were popular writings, widely

and eagerly read. They conjured up glowing pictures of the Messiah and the Messianic age; and in the main they encouraged a spiritual, supernatural conception of Israel's place in the divine plan. In some passages indeed the hope of Israel is fixed upon purely worldly or material objects; the Messiah is of the seed of David; He is to establish a temporal kingdom, and the enemies of Israel are to be destroyed with fire and sword; here exclusive, nationalistic conceptions predominate. On the other hand, we find not infrequent expression of the larger view: the Messiah is to come at the end of the world, and all the Gentiles will submit to Him; the enemies of God are to be destroyed, but with spiritual weapons; "it is no more a question of the supremacy of Israel alone, but all men who are faithful to God are to belong to the Messianic kingdom."¹ And when we turn from the Apocalypses to those books which belong to the Apocrypha, we notice similar conceptions of the destiny of Israel; on the one hand we have in 1 Maccabees xiv. the idealized description of the days of Simon the Maccabee, anticipating the peace and plenty, the justice, the zeal for the Law and the Temple, which are to characterize the times of the Messiah; here the ideal is largely temporal and restricted; but on the other hand we find in Tobit a fine passage which tells of the future return and the building up of the house of God on a more glorious scale, and the conversion of all the nations to fear the Lord God truly; "And all they that love the Lord God in truth and righteousness shall rejoice, shewing mercy to our brethren."²

Here, then, we follow the stream which sprang from the heights of prophecy; sometimes the stream flows within narrow banks; the narrower conceptions of the Messiah and His age had their home on the soil of Palestine among

¹ Oesterley and Box, *Religion and Worship of the Synagogue*, p. 201.

² Tobit xiv. 5-7.

the schools of the Pharisees ; but at times the stream widens out and will not be kept within its narrower bed ; and in these larger, universal hopes and aspirations we have the cherished dreams of the Jews of the Dispersion, who had their homes in the great world outside the hills of Judah.

Whether wide or narrow the current of prophetic ideals and hopes was still flowing ; the expectation which the prophets had aroused was still alive ; and hearts were waiting to enter into the promises up to the very moment when the fulness of the times was come.

But over against this prophetic temper, nurtured and trained by the larger faith of Israel, was that rival temper of which I spoke before, that temper which desired Jerusalem to be fortified with stone walls, which would keep the city of God strictly within the ancient bounds, and leave no room for expansion and growth. While one section of Judaism turned towards the coming age with a large-hearted and open gaze, another section fixed its attention upon the Law and all that it implied. Its spirit was scholastic, national, exclusive ; it was hostile to the larger faith ; and in order to safeguard the position of the Law attempts were made to check the popularity of the apocalyptic books. There was a time when religious effort was bound, as we have seen, to aim at consolidation rather than expansion ; but that time was passed. When Israel's great opportunity arrived the momentous issue presented itself ; which was to prevail, the larger or the narrower faith ? Was the new Jerusalem to be measured out on the lines of the past, or was it to be inhabited as a city without walls and welcome an unlimited access of new citizens, and make the great venture simply trusting in God's protection and abiding presence ?

The Gospel proclaimed by Jesus Christ made it clear

at once how He would decide the issue. Offspring of David's line, the outcome of Israel's eventful history, He made His appeal to the general heart of man, to man's universal need of a Saviour from the guilt of sin, to man's instinctive desire for righteousness and truth ; the universal laws of conduct, the common Fatherhood and Love of God—such was the content of the Gospel. And in proclaiming it, Jesus Christ proved Himself to be the true successor of the prophets, the fulfiller of their hopes and visions. He came not to destroy, but to fulfil, not only the large ideals of the ancient faith, but its moral requirements, its insistence upon holiness both in heart and act. "Think not that I came to destroy the Law and the Prophets." He would advance His kingdom not by excluding anything, but by including all that was capable of being adopted into God's larger plan as it was now announced. And just as Zechariah had been told to see in the Jerusalem of the future a foundation in which the material fabric was interpenetrated and encompassed by the spiritual presence of God, so the kingdom of heaven was founded by Jesus Christ with an outward embodiment, a Church with its external ministry and organization, but living with the life of His Spirit, one corporate whole in which the human is welded with the divine, which exists to bring man into union with God. Here we see the fulfilment of the larger faith of Israel. The stream of prophecy flows without a break into the current of the Christian Church.

When we turn to Rabbinic Judaism, however much we may appreciate its constancy, its learning, its indomitable patience, yet we must admit that it represents an attenuated line of development.¹ It is not large enough to contain the richer faith from which it sprang. Nothing less than the Gospel of Jesus Christ, and the Church of which He is

¹ Oesterley and Box, l.c. p. viii.

the Lord and Head, can satisfy or fulfil the vision of the new Jerusalem. But while we speak of the fulfilment of prophecy let us not forget the lesson which our glance across the ages has suggested. Men were always asking, When are the prophecies to be fulfilled? Again and again the fulfilment was postponed, and it never came in the way which the faithful expected. The non-fulfilment of prophecy is at least as instructive as the fulfilment. And with regard to the vision of Zechariah, which we have been considering, the full realization of it is still to come. The Synagogue, "with its long continuous cry after God for more than twenty-three centuries," may well awake a responsive echo in our hearts. "Sound the great horn for our freedom, and lift a banner to gather our exiles, and gather us into one body from the four corners of the earth"—so runs the tenth of the great Eighteen Prayers of Judaism. And the Jewish liturgy still cherishes the promise given to Zechariah, while the prayer goes up for Jerusalem, "With fire thou didst consume it, and with fire thou wilt again rebuild it, as it is written, For I, saith the Lord, will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and a glory will I be in the midst of her!"

We too may still look forwards to the building and expansion of Jerusalem. Let us beware of our short-sighted views of God's purposes; our human measurements are useless and misleading. The narrow limitations of an older day will not be sufficient for the present or the future. We must have room to expand and grow; we must be large and generous in our welcome to the truth as it unfolds before us. Even if the old defences are inadequate, we will have no fear; but rather address ourselves to our high tasks with a firm confidence in God's protection of God's own cause, in the wall of fire around, in the glory which abides within.

G. A. COOKE.

OPERA FORIS.

MATERIALS FOR THE PREACHER.

VI.

1 THESS. v. 8 :—*Putting on the breastplate (or rather, the coat of mail) of faith and love.*

Faith and love are the coat of mail. They cannot be protected by anything external to themselves. Trust in God is its own defence in an age of doubt and temptation. Love to men carries with it an invincible power which is of its itself sufficient to overcome harshness and cynicism. All that faith and love require is to be *put on*. Their vitality depends upon their exercise. If worn daily, they will protect the believing man against indifference to the claims of God and men ; they will produce a sensitiveness to God and an alertness to the needs of others which safeguard the soul against the deadly wounds of apathy. To exercise a vigilant faith in God, to practise consideration, unselfish help, and self-sacrifice, these, Paul would suggest, are the one safe attitude for a Christian to assume. Occupied with these, he cannot be surprised or overthrown.

Faith is, in fact, its own security, if it is a living faith. It may and does gain support from the fellowship of those who are like-minded. That is one reason why Paul combines here as elsewhere *faith and love*. But this brotherhood or fellowship is in its turn an expression of vital faith in God, so that in the last resort it holds true that "faith is not to be saved by anything that would supersede faith, but only by its faithfulness" (T. H. Green) to the tasks which God reveals to its inner vision. Paul freely recognizes the immense help afforded to Christian faith and love by reliable historical tradition, organization, and definite statements. But he proposes no coat-of-mail *for* faith.

He has absolute confidence in its inherent power of maintaining itself, furnishing its own evidence, and supplying its own vital energy. The worst thing that can happen to it is to be left unused and rusting. Its sorest foe is not the man who assails it from without but the man who, when entrusted and honoured with it, suffers it to fall out of touch with actual life.

* * * * *

1 Tim. v. 24, 25:—

Some men's sins are open beforehand, going before to judgment ;

and some men they follow after.

Likewise also the good works of some are manifest before hand ;

and they that are otherwise cannot be hid.

Most editors take these verses in connexion with what precedes, as a reminder to Timothy that human character is not easy to read, and that the outward life of men requires careful scrutiny before it is passed or rejected by any one who has to make appointments or administer affairs within the society. Men are not always what they seem. They may be either worse or better than a superficial reading of their actions might suggest.

Wohlenberg, in his edition of the epistles (Zahn's *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, xiii. pp. 187 f.), ingeniously proposes on the other hand to connect these verses with the following injunction to Christian slaves (vi. 1-2):—
Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their own masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and of his doctrine be not blasphemed. And they that have believing masters, let them not despise them, because they are brethren. The connexion is as follows, according to Wohlenberg.
 “Slaves occupy a position in which their misdeeds become quickly known and receive immediate punishment, whereas

their good actions are usually allowed to pass unnoticed. On the other hand, when their masters sin, the wrongdoing gets hushed up and palliated, while any praiseworthy action on the part of masters is at once made public and honoured, thanks to their conspicuous position."

This exegesis makes the apostle side with the slaves rather than with their masters, or at least dwell more on the faults of the latter. The former must not bring discredit on the Gospel by impertinence or laziness, nor must they presume on the kindness of such masters as happen to be Christians themselves, by insubordination. Let them not fear that their own virtues will go for nothing. And let them not imagine that their masters' injustice and cruelty will escape the judgment of God.

With the general sentiment we may compare Mr. Yorke's method (in *Shirley*, chap. iv.), when he got vexed with successful evil in this world. He "believed fully that there was such a thing as judgment to come. If it were otherwise, it would be difficult to imagine how all the scoundrels who seemed triumphant in this world, who broke innocent hearts with impunity, abused unmerited privileges, were a scandal to honourable callings, took the bread out of the mouths of the poor, browbeat the humble, and truckled meanly to the rich and proud—were to be properly paid off, in such coin as they had earned. But," he added, "whenever he got low-spirited about such like goings-on and their seeming success in this mucky lump of a planet, he just reached down t'owd book" (pointing to a great Bible in the book-case), "opened it like at a chance, and he was sure to light of a verse blazing wi' a blue brimstone glow that set all straight. He knew," he said, "where some folk was bound for, just as weel as if an angel wi' great white wings had come in ower t' door-stone and told him."

Lamentations i. 4: *She is in bitterness.*

The threefold cause of Judah's bitter experience after the exile. Her sense of humiliation was due to (a) the bitterness of weakness. She was unable to help herself or to secure assistance from other people (ver. 7):—

*Her people fell into the hand of the adversary,
and none did help her.*

Even those allies and neighbours on whom she might have counted, have failed her at the emergency,¹ and proved but fair-weather friends (ver. 2):—

*Among all her lovers she hath none to comfort her ;
All her friends have dealt treacherously with her.*

To the humiliation of this impotence must be added (b) the bitterness of memory. "Sorrow's crown of sorrow" for the captive nation is "remembering happier things" and times (ver. 7):—

*Jerusalem remembereth in the days of her affliction and of her
miseries*

all the pleasant things that she had in the days of old.

The comparison between the bright past and the grey present is part of the nation's anguish. Then finally, (c) there is the bitterness of confession. She has but herself to blame, after all, for the disaster (ver. 8):—

*Jerusalem hath grievously sinned ;
Therefore she is become as an unclean thing.*

She has been the victim of her own folly: that is the reflection which adds poignancy to her sense of shame and defeat and loneliness. In the last resort, she cannot honestly blame any one except herself for what has happened. She had brought it on herself.

JAMES MOFFATT.

¹ Compare Swift's remark to Stella: "I have many friends and many enemies, and the last are more constant in their nature."

INDEX.

	PAGE
Very Rev. J. H. Bernard, D.D., D.C.L.	
St. Paul's Doctrine of the Resurrection: a Study of 1 Corinthians xv.	403, 491
Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D., Litt.D.	
Ezekiel's Visions of Jerusalem	525
Stanley A. Cook, M.A.	
Supplementary Notes on the New Aramaic Papyri	87
Rev. Canon G. A. Cooke, M.A.	
The Expansion of Jerusalem	556
Rev. Professor Adolf Deissmann, D.D., D.Theol.	
New Testament Philology	61
Rev. Professor James Denney, D.D.	
The Cup of the Lord and the Cup of Demons	289
He that Came by Water and Blood	416
Rev. Professor S. R. Driver, D.D., Litt.D.	
The Aramaic Inscription from Syria	481
Rev. Alex. R. Eagar, D.D.	
St. Luke's Account of the Last Supper: a Critical Note on the Second Sacrament	252, 343
Rev. Professor G. G. Findlay, D.D.	
The Parable of the Pearl-Merchant	158
Rev. Principal A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.	
Studies in the Pauline Theology.	
I. The Experience of Paul	193
Rev. Professor G. Buchanan Gray, D.D., Litt.D.	
The Heavenly Temple and the Heavenly Altar	385, 530

	PAGE
Professor J. Rendel Harris, M.A., Litt.D.	
Dr. Gregory on the Canon and Text of the New Testament	127
The Present State of the Controversy over the Place and Time of the Birth of Christ	208
J. H. A. Hart, M.A.	
A Plea for the Recognition of the Fourth Gospel as an Historical Authority	361
Rev. Professor W. F. Lofthouse, M.A.	
The Social Teaching of the Law	449
Rev. Professor D. S. Margoliouth, M.A., Litt.D.	
Ecclesiastes and Ecclesiasticus	118
Folklore in the Old Testament	304
Rev. James Moffatt, D.D.	
Materials for the Preacher	76, 186, 277, 379, 475, 565
The New Schürer	223
Rev. Professor J. H. Moulton, M.A., Litt.D.	
Rev. George Milligan, D.D.	
Lexical Notes from the Papyri	51, 170, 262
Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D.	
The Parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard	333
Rev. Professor James Orr, D.D.	
The Resurrection of Jesus—	
1. The Present State of the Question	35
2. Its Nature as Miracle	142
3. The Gospel Narratives and Critical Solvents	233
4. The Credibility of the Witness—The Burial	314
5. The Easter Message	428
6. The Post-Resurrection Appearances	504
Professor Sir W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D., D.D.	
The Morning Star and the Chronology of the Life of Christ	1
Rev. Professor J. H. Ropes, D.D.	
“Thou hast Faith and I have Works”	547